

Wm. J. Bryan

HIS WONDERFUL CAMPAIGN OF THE STATE.

GREETED BY THOUSANDS.

SPEAKS IN THE OPEN WHERE ALL CAN HEAR.

His Speech at Wymore on Monday a Masterly Plea for Our Country's Good, with Ways and Means Outlined—Spurting Chatter of Republican Politicians Exposed by the Searchlight of Reasoning.

Bryan's campaigning in Nebraska has been simply wonderful. The people everywhere were "watching and waiting" for him. They flocked to hear him by the thousands. Delegations came by wagon trains sometimes as many as three hundred teams in a single procession. No opera house, hall or other enclosure could accommodate the people. The meetings had to be held out on the broad acres. The people had to be measured by the acre. It was all the same, whether sunshine or rain, the people came. The refusal to run special trains even upon guarantees simply made it harder to get to him, but they got there just the same. The reports industriously circulated that Bryan was ill and could not fill his appointments only made the people more determined than ever to go and see for themselves.

Mr. Bryan spoke at West Point, Norfolk, North Platte, Lexington, Kearney, Minden, Wilcox, Holdrege, Arapahoe, McCook, Trenton and Wymore.

The account of one of these meetings is an account of all of them. The same enthusiasm, the same surging throngs, the same yeomanry, the same determination, the same loyal American citizens and Nebraskans greeted him at every point. All along the route crowds gathered and cheered even the train train as it passed by.

Of course the people respect, admire, love, they love Bryan, but after all it is because he is the great American, their tribune, and represents their ideas of good government. Wherever Mr. Bryan was there was where it looked as if a presidential campaign was at white heat.

BRYAN'S WYMORE SPEECH.

The arguments in support of bimetalism are unanswerable. I desire to suggest a few propositions which our opponents will not attempt to meet or even refer to. First—The bimetallic system has been more universally commended than any other policy ever adopted by the government of the United States, and continued until 1873. During all that experience of eighty-one years no political party in national convention ever demanded its abandonment. What other policy has proven so acceptable? Whenever we have a high tariff there is always some party denouncing it; when we have a low tariff there is generally some party denouncing it, but we had bimetalism for more than three-quarters of a century, during which time no party arose to question its advantage to the people. Will the republican newspapers answer this argument in favor of bimetalism?

Second proposition—The gold standard was adopted in 1873 without any party asking for it; it was adopted without the American people having discussed the subject; it was adopted without the legislature knowing what was being done, and many believe that the change was effected fraudulently. In recent years the advocates of the gold standard have declared that no bill could pass through congress without its contents being known. Events have recently overturned this contention. If any republican says it is impossible to insert any provision in a bill without the knowledge of congress, ask him who concealed section 22 in the Dingley bill. The Dingley bill passed the house and senate, and after it had passed both bodies was signed by the president, and yet the question, "Who wrote section 22?" will go down to history along with that other famous interrogatory, "Who struck Billy Patterson?"

Third—The gold standard was in existence in the United States for twenty-three years before any political party dared to defend it. Do you know of any other policy that the United States ever endured for twenty-three years without no party bold enough to defend it? In 1892 the republican party adopted a platform which contained these words, "The American people from tradition and interest favor bimetalism." Thus it will be seen that the republican party repudiated the gold standard after nineteen years of experience under it. The democratic party of that year said, "We hold to the use of gold and silver as the standard money of the country and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage."

Thus it will be seen that the democratic party declared in favor of the double standard of gold and silver after nineteen years' experience with the gold standard. The qualifying words contained in the republican and democratic platforms did not lessen the force in favor of the declaration in favor of bimetalism, but merely related to the means of securing it. The popular platform of 1892 not only declared for bimetalism, but named the ratio of 16 to 1. In 1892 not a single national party pledged itself to gold monometalism. Will the republican newspapers explain why nineteen years of experience failed to prove the gold standard a blessing? In 1896 the democratic party, the populist party and the national silver party joined in demanding the immediate restoration of free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation. Six millions and a half of voters—more than ever supported one proposition before in the history of the country—supported this condemnation of the gold standard and the demand for bimetalism; but you will say that the republican party polled more votes than all three of the parties named. Yes, we admit that the election returns showed more than seven million voters supporting the republican platform, but what was the platform. The platform pledged the republican party to aid in over-

throwing the gold standard and in substituting the double standard by international agreement. Mr. McKinley, in his letter of acceptance, renewed this pledge, and stated that it would be his duty if elected to carry it out. Can a pledge to get rid of the gold standard be considered an endorsement of it? The republican party simply insisted that the United States must maintain the gold standard until the leading commercial nations of the world join in abandoning it. Unless the republicans repudiate the pledge to aid in restoring the gold standard by international agreement they cannot count the decision of last year a victory for gold monometalism.

We denounced the gold standard last year and pointed out the evils that it had brought to the American people. The president, by recommending the appointment of a commission, admitted that our denunciation was well grounded. Congress appropriated \$100,000 to pay the expenses of the commission while it labors to persuade the nations of Europe to help us get rid of the gold standard. If any republican says that the gold standard is a good thing, ask him why our commission is now abroad trying to get rid of it? If you want to know the strength of the gold standard sentiment, examine the vote cast by the party which ever adopted a national platform in favor of the gold standard. The bolting democrats were not convinced by experience. When they were members of the Chicago convention they joined in the minority report, in which they expressed the fear that independent free coinage by the United States "would retard or entirely prevent the establishment of international bimetalism, to which the efforts of the government should be steadily directed." If they were in favor of international bimetalism at Chicago and did not come out openly for the gold standard until two months later, when they met at Indianapolis. Were they honestly in favor of international bimetalism in Chicago, or were they trying to practice chicanery upon the convention? If they were honestly in favor of international bimetalism, why were they converted to gold monometalism between the Chicago convention and the Indianapolis convention. At any rate they made a fight for the gold standard in the United States—precinct by precinct, county by county, and only six votes in the United States, and the gold democrats only polled three out of the six; Mr. McKinley received two and I received one.

I have charged that the gold standard is a fraud behind a mask. The claim that the last election resulted in a victory for the gold standard is a confession of our charge, because the victory of last year was only won under the pretense of an attempt to secure international bimetalism, but the president now carrying out the attempt and the taxpayers are meeting the expense of the commission. We have also asserted that the opposition to bimetalism comes from the capitalist classes. It is true in this country. The money changers, the bankers, the boards of trade and the chambers of commerce have been the nucleus about which the supporters of the gold standard clustered. Within three years the German Reichstag declared in favor of international bimetalism, and the British government had the gold standard for more than twenty years, but immediately the Berlin chamber of commerce declared that the gold standard was all right, and thus far the Berlin chamber of commerce has had more influence than the Reichstag.

I have a dispatch published in the papers of the United States of July 25. I read it to you to show you the direction from which opposition to bimetalism comes. Since the republicans have declared their inability to resist the gold standard upon the financial question, they will certainly be interested in any news from London, to which they are now looking for relief from the sufferings imposed upon this country by the gold standard. The dispatch is printed in the London, July 24, and reads as follows: "A definite answer is expected from the British government within the next few days to the proposition of the United States and France for a bimetallic conference. The United States commission is confident that the invitation will be accepted, but the movement meets with the solid opposition of British capitalists, who argue that the British financial system is satisfactory and that the government should not be called upon to assist other governments that may be in distress."

I call your attention to the fact that the opposition to international bimetalism comes from British capitalists. Does this not support our charge? I call attention also to the fact that the British capitalists consider our government in distress. What will the British capitalists do if a republican president had been in office four months, and yet the British capitalists thought our government in distress.

But let me read further: "The only argument which weighs with them (the British capitalists) in favor of international action is taken for the coinage of silver, the free silver party will succeed in the United States, and bring of a financial panic in which the British investments would suffer." I call attention to the fact that the only argument which weighs with British capitalists, unless international action is taken for the coinage of silver, the free silver party will succeed in the United States. If we want to secure the co-operation of the British capitalists, we must appeal not to their love of the gold standard, but to their love of silver. Then again, you will notice that when they speak of being afraid of a panic, they are concerned about British investments and not American interests.

The last sentence of the dispatch is still more interesting. It reads, "It is understood that this argument (the possibility of a free silver victory) has been advanced by one of the commissioners who has been most active in endeavoring to enlist the support of the Rothschilds and other big financiers." This sentence evidently refers to Mr. Wolcott, who was active in securing the appointment of the commission. Can it be that Mr. Wolcott is trying to scare the British capitalists? What right has the republican party to scare British capitalists? British capitalists have succeeded in scaring the republican party, but the republican platform didn't promise that the republican party would scare the British capitalists. It will be noticed that Mr. Wolcott went directly to Rothschild and other big financiers instead of going to small financiers. In this he showed good business sense. It would have been a loss of time to go to the small financiers. When Mr. Wolcott secured the aid of the big financiers, he will at the same time secure the support of the little financiers, who every morning pay their devotion to the financial power of parliament, but what difference does it make what Parliament did or what the chancellor of the exchequer pledged if the bankers are able to frighten the government? Did not the bankers of London unanimously pledge at Indianapolis after the election and demand the permanent maintenance of the gold standard after ninety-nine per cent of the people had voted against the gold

standard necessary for us to endure the gold standard until other nations should decide to take pity upon us. It is a significant fact that Mr. Wolcott abandoned the republican position and began to threaten the British capitalists. To carry out the republican platform, Mr. Wolcott would have been compelled to make a speech about as follows: "Financiers of Europe: The American people have tried the gold standard for twenty-three years and are tired of it. It is fastened upon them without their asking for it, and they are now laboring to rid themselves of it. They know that you have gained a list of dollars which they have lost in falling prices, and I come at their request to ask you to join in the restoration of bimetalism so that you cannot rob them any more. But in order to be entirely candid with you, I feel it my duty to say that while the American people realize that you have benefited by their expense, they are willing to stand by you and maintain the gold standard forever if you refuse to join them in putting an end to your unjust advantage and to their undeserved suffering."

Of course Mr. Wolcott has too much sense to make such a speech as I have suggested, and yet that speech would carry out the idea contained in the republican platform. Instead of saying to the financiers that the American people will continue the gold standard indefinitely, Mr. Wolcott now seems to be pointing out the probability of a free silver victory in order to scare England into sending delegates to the conference. Now, I am in favor of helping Mr. Wolcott.

I was proud of the manner in which the silver forces bowed the will of the majority. We did not know just where the majority came from, but we bowed to it. I am not only in favor of accepting defeat gracefully, but I am in favor of helping the administration to carry out any good policy which may be suggested. The administration is now trying to get rid of the gold standard. I am in hearty sympathy with the effort. Bimetalism will be a good thing for our people, no matter what party brings it. Since we cannot try independent bimetalism before 1900, I am in favor of helping the republicans to secure international bimetalism in the meantime if it is possible to do so. I am going to take it for granted that the republicans who supported Mr. McKinley last fall are going to support international bimetalism, and I am going to propose a plan by which they can render the assistance. According to the dispatch which I read to you, the only argument that has any weight with the British capitalists is the fear of a free coinage victory. Now let us make that fear as strong as possible. Let all the republicans who desire international bimetalism vote with us, so that the majority will be overwhelming in favor of free silver. The news will be called to London. Mr. Wolcott will carry the news to the big financiers, and say, "I told you so, I told you so. The silver sentiment is growing in the United States, and the free silver party will win sure if you don't hurry up and send delegates to assist our government in securing international bimetalism before 1900. Suppose Nebraska goes republican, the news will be called to London—unless the republicans get out an injunction to prohibit the spread of news—and when Mr. Wolcott tries to scare the big financiers, they will be prepared to answer him. They will point to the fact that Nebraska is an agricultural state. They will point to the fact that the farmers of Nebraska turned down a free silver candidate and elected a gold standard candidate. Just to show their opposition to silver, they will point to the fact that Nebraska wants international bimetalism, they must help us back Mr. Wolcott in his attempt to scare the British capitalists. The moment the fear of a free silver victory disappears, that moment the British capitalists will be gone with the British capitalists will be gone."

But let me read another dispatch. I have here a dispatch from London dated Sept. 22. It tells of a meeting of the bankers of London called to protest against the proposed restoration of the Bank of England. It seems that Mr. Hugh Smith, the governor, announced that the bank, in order to aid international bimetalism, would keep one-fifth of its reserves in silver. This was a slight concession. In fact, the conditions attached to it made it of no importance, and yet, the bankers met and entered an unanimous protest against even this slight concession. The dispatch says that there was a large attendance of representatives of "powerful interests" and that the number of financiers, though few in number, was described as a "powerful interest." The majority of the people in Nebraska are engaged in farming, and yet the farmers of Nebraska are never described as a "powerful interest." The railroads of Nebraska are a powerful interest, but the financier of the state constitutes a powerful interest, but why are the farmers not powerful? Simply because the railroads and financiers make a business out of politics, while the farmers are content with their party ticket regardless of the platform of the policies involved.

The dispatch also contains these significant words: "The bankers who were present at today's meeting were pledged to secrecy in regard to the proceedings." You elected a president pledged to international bimetalism. The commission appointed by him has visited France and found France willing to join in an international agreement. It next visited Germany, and found Germany inclined to accept the English proposal, or more than two months it has been waiting for England's decision. When at last a slight concession seemed in sight, the bankers of London joined in an unanimous protest and pledged themselves to secrecy in regard to the proceedings. You elected a president pledged to international bimetalism. The commission appointed by him has visited France and found France willing to join in an international agreement. It next visited Germany, and found Germany inclined to accept the English proposal, or more than two months it has been waiting for England's decision. When at last a slight concession seemed in sight, the bankers of London joined in an unanimous protest and pledged themselves to secrecy in regard to the proceedings. You elected a president pledged to international bimetalism. The commission appointed by him has visited France and found France willing to join in an international agreement. It next visited Germany, and found Germany inclined to accept the English proposal, or more than two months it has been waiting for England's decision. When at last a slight concession seemed in sight, the bankers of London joined in an unanimous protest and pledged themselves to secrecy in regard to the proceedings.

But let me read a still later dispatch from London. On Sept. 23 a dispatch came across the ocean containing an interview from a high official who was a participant in the negotiations between the United States, bimetallic commission, and the British cabinet. He is quoted as saying to a representative of the Associated Press: "I fear the bankers will frighten the government into receding from their stand for bimetalism. Think of it, a high official is afraid that the bankers will frighten the English government. They must have a government over there a good deal like ours, because ours has been frightened by the bankers several times. The high official continued: "They have forgotten that Parliament is unanimously resolved to secure a stable exchange of exchange between gold and silver and that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, chancellor of the exchequer, pledged himself to do all in his power to carry the resolution into effect." No, the bankers have not forgotten the power of parliament, but what difference does it make what Parliament did or what the chancellor of the exchequer pledged if the bankers are able to frighten the government? Did not the bankers of London unanimously pledge at Indianapolis after the election and demand the permanent maintenance of the gold standard after ninety-nine per cent of the people had voted against the gold

standard and in favor of the double standard?

But the high official calls attention to another important fact. He says that English public opinion has been gradually changing. Until recently they denied that anything was wrong, but last year they admitted that something had to be done. They recognized that the patient was sick, but they mistook the disease and began treating for an overloaded stomach when as a matter of fact the patient was hungry. Now they have reached a point where they admit that low prices were bad. Next year everybody will be in favor of dollar wheat. We will promise to keep wheat up by increasing the volume of money through free coinage, and the republicans will pledge themselves to keep up the price by continuing the famine in India.

Some one connected with the agricultural department has been claiming a rise in the price of a number of agricultural products. This is a very dangerous argument for a republican to make. Last year when we advocated bimetalism as a means of raising prices, the republicans insisted that a general rise in prices would result in the cheapening of the dollar, and we were told that to pay debts in a dollar of less purchasing power than the dollar borrowed, was equivalent to repudiation. Now the republicans are boasting that the dollar will not buy so much as it did last year. It is not bad enough to have six millions and a half of voters accused of repudiation without having seven millions more try to break into our company and share the odium? There is a marked difference between the republican plan of raising prices and the plan proposed by the advocates of bimetalism. Republicans want to raise the price of a few things by law and then claim credit for a rise due to causes over which they have no control, while bimetalists desire to raise the level of prices by making silver a competitor with gold as a standard money. For instance, if a high tariff enables the sugar trust to raise the price of sugar, who will suffer unless they have a corresponding increase in income. I noticed in a recent commercial report that woolen goods have gone up ten to fifteen per cent, while raw cotton has gone down about eighteen per cent within the last few weeks. If we are to buy our goods at the price of a grower that lower cotton and higher clothes bring him prosperity. Take my own case for instance. I have five acres near Lincoln which I was reserving for a dumping ground for silver, but when a election was against us I put it in corn. And the same year, 1894, when Mr. Cleveland was president and we had a Wilson bill in force, what wheat was worth only about fifty-five cents at that time. Now wheat has gone up to ninety cents, and December corn, under a republican president and with the Dingley bill in operation, is only worth a little more than thirty cents in Chicago. With corn worth less and flour higher than in December, 1894, how can we corn growers share in republican prosperity if Mr. Hanna had told us of his intention to bring on the famine in India. I would have put my whole farm in wheat, but probably I have no right to expect any inside information under this administration.

Let me call attention to another vindication of our arguments of last fall. The republicans have been demanding the price of silver could be raised by legislation. They used to recognize the force of law when they made laws, but now they are quite sure that law is impotent to affect the price of silver. When the law buying silver was enacted in 90, Secretary Rusk pointed to the effect of the law in raising the price of silver, and also called attention to the fact that wheat and other agricultural products advanced with silver. He pointed out that we were in competition with the countries of the world, and that the price of wheat fell in Liverpool as the gold price of silver fell. This year the extraordinary famine in India has prevented the export of wheat from India and at the same time lessened the demand for wheat in India. Thus wheat and silver have been separated by a cause perfectly apparent.

In addition to the crop conditions in India, it must be remembered that Japan and Peru have recently joined in the demand for silver, and the legislation has had its effect. The price of silver is regulated by the law of supply and demand. If the demand for it is lessened, either from accidental conditions or by legislation, the effect is a fall in price. Anything which increases the demand increases the price. Notice that silver rose nearly eight cents between September 1 and September 20, and the press dispatches stated that the rise was due to purchases of silver for India and to rumors in London that India was buying silver for coinage. If the rumor that India is buying silver for coinage can raise the price of American silver nearly eight cents in twenty days, how much greater the effect if free coinage was restored in the United States and seventy millions of people were buying silver for coinage in competition with gold. We contend that free and unlimited coinage of silver in the United States would create such a demand for silver that the price of silver would be raised to \$1.29 per ounce measured by gold, and the use of silver as a standard with gold would lessen the demand for gold and thus raise the level of prices. Can the republican newspapers admit the rise in silver due to a mere rumor of purchases by India and yet deny that free coinage in the United States would raise the price of silver? The moment that the republicans admit that the effect of free coinage would be to raise the price of silver, the only difference of opinion is upon the amount of the rise. The advocates of free coinage contend that the bullion price of silver should be raised to the mint price and the silver dollar made as good as the gold dollar, whether melted or coined here or anywhere else in the world. Our opponents are not able to fix the point to which silver would rise, but merely insist that we are helping to restore silver and must wait for relief from other nations.

The democrats, populists and silver republicans joined together last year to secure the restoration of bimetalism. If they were wise to join the forces last year, they are wise to continue the co-operation this year, because the fight is not yet won. But there is an additional reason for joining our forces. The populist party has always opposed the retirement of the greenbacks. The democrats and silver republicans are opposed to retiring the greenbacks. It is evident that the republican party is now planning to retire greenbacks. A republican victory in Nebraska will encourage the republican senator and members from Nebraska to vote for the retirement of the greenbacks. The defeat of the republican party will encourage the republican senators and members of the congress that the people of Nebraska are opposed to the retirement of the greenbacks. Silver was demonetized by stealth and we have been fighting for twenty years to restore it. It is merely a matter of time before we will be asked to transfer from the government to the banking institutions the sovereign right to issue money. The republican party did not demand the retirement of the greenbacks last fall. On the contrary, Mr. McKinley stated in his letter of acceptance that the republican party would keep in circulation all the silver and paper moneys now included in the currency of the country. Yet, in spite of this pledge the president has recommended the appointment of a commis-

sion to reform the currency and evidently intends to support the Indianapolis reform. It is an effort to retire the greenbacks. Will the populists and silver republicans allow themselves to be deceived into aiding in the movement? Is it true that the populists, democrats and silver republicans do not agree upon all questions? The united front to secure an American financial system for the American people. They were unsuccessful, but the fight has been renewed. It is the part of wisdom for these three parties to fight the common enemy rather than fight each other. When we have rescued our nation from the money changers and saved the greenbacks from destruction, it will be time enough to quarrel over our differences.

By acting together we have redeemed Nebraska from republican rule. By acting together we elected Senator Allen, the best senator Nebraska ever had. By acting together we elected Governor Holcomb, the best governor Nebraska ever had. By acting together we elected a treasurer who uses the state money to pay state debts instead of loaning it to favorite banks. By acting together we elected an attorney general who is protecting the interests of the people. By acting together we have elected an honest set of judges and four members of congress. There is every reason why we should continue to act together in this campaign and elect a supreme judge who will not be tempted to relieve republican officials from their just responsibilities. There is every reason why we should stand together and elect our whole ticket. To defeat our ticket would be to take a backward step on national questions and to declare that the republican state administration was more satisfactory than the present administration. Let every populist, democrat and free silver republican go to the polls early and make the majority as large as possible.

ABOUT 700,000 DOLLARS.

Saved to Nebraska by a Change in Administration.

Lincoln, Neb., Oct. 25.—Regardless of party affiliations, it is to the interest of every taxpayer in Nebraska to have an honest, economical administration of the business affairs connected with the state government. Taxpayers of Nebraska should bear in mind that they foot the bills. If their money is lavishly spent for the princely entertainment of friends of the heads of state institutions, and to gratify the greed of political hangers-on, who were numerous around the state offices under the republican regime, taxes are heavier and taxpayers have in many instances to deprive themselves of comforts, and even necessities. The reform forces have materially reduced the running expenses of every branch of the state government and of every institution in the state. They have made the burdens of the taxpayers easier to bear. They have made humane reforms in the management of state institutions which make more tolerable the condition of the state's unfortunate wards. They have "stood up for Nebraska" by being faithful to the interests confined in them.

It must be remembered that during the years 1895-96 only six institutions were under control of Governor Holcomb. The other seven institutions were under the control of the Board of Public Lands and Buildings, all republicans. During those two years the legislature made at the six institutions managed by populists and democrats compared with the most economical years of the republican regime, viz: 1893-94, was exactly \$99,524.75, as will be seen by an examination of the report of the auditor. During that same period the state institutions under the control of the republican board of state officers made a net reduction of \$6,854.12 in running expenses as compared with the expenses during Governor Crouse's term of office, 1893-94.

Only one entire semi-annual period has been covered since the advent of complete reform control, but the report shows marked reductions in all of the state institutions hereafter mentioned after by the republican board. The co-operation of the new Board of Purchase and Supplies with the Governor has also had an appreciable effect in reducing expenses. The reform forces have also appointed efficient republican office holders. Governor Holcomb saved the taxpayers of Nebraska \$200,000 during his first term by insisting on the practice of rigid economy and unswerving honesty by his appointees in all the state institutions. With the assistance of the fellow state officers during 1897-98, if the present rate of saving is kept up, and it will be, it is safe to predict that half a million dollars will be saved. The extravagances, rashness and inefficiency of republican office holders have been succeeded by the application of honest business principles under fusion management. Whether republican, populist, democrat or prohibitionist, every citizen should be in the benefits of this practical reform.

As an individual instance of how state officers, inspired with a desire to conduct the affairs of the state with prudence, economy and practical business methods, have succeeded in reducing the cost of the state prison, the attention is directed to the reduced expense of maintaining the convicts at the state prison. When Governor Holcomb assumed the duties of his office the state was paying forty cents per day for the maintenance of each convict incarcerated in the penitentiary, in addition to the pitance received from heartless contractors for the convicts' hard labor. Despite the despicable fight made by Commissioner Russell, backed by Messrs. Piper, Barber and Churchill, the other members of the board, to defeat the economic measures instituted by Warden Leidigh, the cost of keeping convicts was reduced for 1895-96 from 40 to 26 1-2 cents per day. Under the absolute control of the present state officers, and having a chief of interests of the people whom they serve, the state prison will be finally made self-supporting. The days of Stout-Mosher-Dorgan steals at the state prison are ended, and the institution is being conducted in the interest of the taxpayers of Nebraska.

The asylum for chronic insane, at Hastings, was the pride of republican state officers. When the boys got control of it, republicans wept bitter tears and vowed that all sorts of evils to the institution would come. But they didn't. The per capita cost for the six months period covered by each report has been reduced from \$138.67 maximum to \$56.82 minimum. In other words, it is used to cost 75 cents per day per patient at Hastings asylum, and it now costs but thirty-one cents.

Similar comparisons could be made in other state institutions. This is enough to convince any intelligent, fair-minded citizen of Nebraska that it is to his personal interest to cast a vote for the fusion ticket. A vote cast under the populist, democrat or silver republican emblem is a vote cast for an honest, economical, businesslike management of the state's affairs. Vote for Sullivan. The supreme bench needs a man who will give the same attention to the cause of the poor man as to the interests of the corporation. Such a man is John J. Sullivan. Vote for Kenoyer and Von Forell. The educational, as well as the financial interests of the University of Nebraska, need the services of these two honest, conscientious men. They will be the guardians of the people's interests there.