

dollar if they had intended to raise prices and lower the purchasing power of the dollar immediately afterwards?

In the second place, the republicans called us repudiators because we promised to increase the volume of money and raise prices. They charged that a rise in prices would cheapen the dollar and that a cheaper dollar would enable people to repudiate their debts by paying them with less purchasing power than they borrowed. Is it fair to assume that the republicans would have called us repudiators if they had themselves intended to do the very thing that we promised to do? In 1896 the republicans not only said that we had enough money, but they said that it did not matter whether we had much or little provided it was all good. They now boast that we have five hundred millions of money in circulation more than we had in 1896, and they claim credit for the improvement in industrial conditions caused by the increase in circulation. This increase in the circulation can be attributed, first, to the European famine in '97 which enabled us to sell an unusually large amount of bread-stuffs at higher prices than prevailed for some years. The republicans did not bring the larger crop, neither did they cause the famine in Europe, therefore they cannot claim credit for that portion of the increased circulation derived from this source. A part of the increase came from the coining of the seigniorage in the treasury, and this was not recommended by the republican administration nor desired by the republican leaders, but was forced upon the republicans by the silver men in the senate.

The most important factor in the increased circulation was the increased production of gold, largely due to the discovery of gold in the Klondike. The republicans cannot claim credit for the discovery, and therefore cannot claim credit for the results that followed. There is one factor in the increase for which the republican party is responsible, namely, the increase in the national bank circulation, but this increase was not due to the desire of the republican party to increase the circulation, for it was trying to retire the greenbacks at the same time that it increased the bank circulation, and only increased the latter because the national banks desired to secure the profit on a larger issue of their notes.

The republicans cannot claim credit for such improvement in the industrial conditions as was caused by the war which took many men out of the labor market, by creating a demand for government supplies, and by mortgaging the future for money to spend in the present, because they claim that they were forced into the Spanish war by the democrats, and they deny that they have desired to continue the Philippine war merely for the purpose of having war.

The analysis of the claims of the republican party will show that they have no policies which are calculated to bring a permanent prosperity to the masses of the people, but that the time of their leaders is divided between appropriating to the party the benefits that come from our form of government, from our natural resources and from the industry of the people—between appropriating these blessings to the benefit of the party and the distribution of favors to the influential members of society.

While ordinary citizens accumulate slowly by hard labor and in spite of unjust taxes and an unfair financial system, and in spite of the private monopolies which are springing up all over the land, the beneficiaries of republican legislation grow rich by leaps and bounds through their power to collect tribute from the masses.

The republican policies are supported by contradictory arguments. The republican leaders tell the wool-growers that a tariff on wool will raise the price of the wool, while they tell the consumers of woolen goods that a tariff on woolen goods will lower the price of the goods.

They tell the people that free coinage would double the profit of the mine owner by making fifty cents' worth of silver worth a dollar, and they warn the depositor that the metal would not be increased in value by the law, but that the miner would only convert fifty cents' worth of silver into a fifty-cent dollar and not make any profit at all. They promise to destroy the trusts, and then argue that a trust is a natural development of the times, necessary to the prosperity of the country and to the extension of our foreign commerce, but they promise that they will protect the people from it.

No one can listen to a republican speech that attempts to cover all the issues without noting the number of times in which the speaker answers his own arguments. One is reminded of the story of the man who traveled in the mountains by a path that was so crooked that he often "met himself coming back." And yet take away the pros-

perity argument from the republican party and it has nothing.

When industrial conditions become normal and republican policies begin to bear fruit, that party will be defenseless and its leaders unable to give a reason for their blind faith in the party's omnipotence and omniscience.

### Exchanging Compliments.

Day by day the true inwardness of Speaker Henderson's withdrawal is being more clearly revealed.

In an interview given out at Atlantic City, N. J., the speaker is reported as saying that Governor Cummins wants to use free trade to hit the trusts, and that he is opposed to free trade. Governor Cummins doubts the correctness of the interview, but says that if true it exhibits a petulency due to the discovery that he (the speaker) is out of harmony with his constituents. Governor Cummins concludes:

"Every republican in the state of Iowa who is interested in the subject knows that I never directly or indirectly advocated free trade as a remedy for the so-called trusts. What the platform says, and what I have tried at various times to say, is this: 'That a monopoly, whether established by a trust, partnership or individual, is not entitled to the benefit of tariff duties; and that if this were the law it would have some effect in preventing the creation of monopolies.' It is not necessary to the business of the country that monopolies shall exist, and ambitious men should be informed that they cannot have both monopolies and the tariff. You can be sure they will choose the course most profitable to them. If my friend Henderson cannot understand the difference between the proposition I have just stated and the proposition that free trade is the remedy for trusts he has not greatly profited by his twenty years in congress."

The first round seems to be a draw and it is to be hoped that it will be fought to a finish. The republican leaders know that they must oppose all tariff reduction or face the demolition of the whole system. The various tariff schedules cannot stand on their own merits; they must "hang together or hang separately." The contest between the high and low tariff republicans will be an interesting one and the democrats will be glad to encourage both sides with words of sympathy and condolence.

### Inexcusable Mendacity.

The Missouri State Republican, published at St. Louis, in its issue of October 3 says:

Bryan receives \$5,000 from the state democratic campaign fund for speaking in Missouri. It is, apparently, a purely commercial proposition with him. He must know, for it has been published far and wide, that the men in actual control of the Missouri democracy have declared against the issue which he himself raised and which is the only possible excuse for his continuance on the political stage. In accepting pay for advocating his "principles" Bryan descends to the level of a common entertainer, in a line with Marshall P. Wilder or any other vaudeville "star."

The Republican is the official organ of the republican state committee and this charge is reproduced in order that the readers of The Commoner may know the desperate and mendacious means resorted to by the republican leaders.

Now as to the facts: Upon invitation of the democratic state committee Mr. Bryan delivered twenty speeches in Missouri. The subject of compensation was never mentioned. The committee never offered and Mr. Bryan never asked for any compensation. During the trip through Missouri he was asked to send in a statement of his expenses and he replied that he was interested in the campaign and preferred to contribute his expenses to the campaign fund. When he reached home, however, he found a letter from the committee saying that the committee would not consent to his paying his traveling expenses and enclosing a check for two hundred dollars with a request that he inform the committee if that did not cover his outlay. Mr. Bryan returned the check, saying that his expenses did not exceed one hundred dollars and again asked that the amount be considered a contribution to the campaign fund. Now these are the facts

and they could have been secured from either the committee or Mr. Bryan. Why did the Republican publish this deliberate and inexcusable falsehood? And why will less prominent republican papers repeat the falsehood? There can be but one reason. It is natural that a republican should use the best argument he has on hand and a resort to misrepresentation and prevarication is positive proof that the republicans are not prepared to meet the arguments presented by the democrats.

The sources of Mr. Bryan's income are well known. There is nothing secret about his business affairs. He does not object to exceptional scrutiny, but why don't the republicans investigate the incomes of republican officials and candidates and the sources from which they are obtained? Why doesn't the Missouri republican committee report on Mr. Kerens' income and the sources thereof?

Mr. Bryan's income is derived from his lectures and his pen, and he has time enough left to devote nearly two months of this year to campaign speeches and for these speeches he not only receives no pay, but for the most part he pays his own expenses and does not ride on passes either. He is interested in the reforms which he advocates and is glad to aid the men who are fighting for these reforms. During the past six years he has given more than nineteen thousand dollars to various campaign committees, besides devoting a considerable portion of each year to political speeches delivered without compensation in different parts of the country. If republican papers desired to be fair they would compute the amount which Mr. Bryan might make if the time devoted to political speeches were devoted to lecturing, and then consider that sum a cash contribution to politics, but instead of that they try to lessen the force of his speeches by accusing him of making money out of campaign work.

Mr. Bryan only receives pay for speeches when he lectures or when for business reasons money is raised by merchants to cover the expenses of a picnic, fair, carnival or something of that nature. Democrats need not fear to denounce as false in toto such charges as that quoted above whenever and wherever they appear.

### Equality Before the Law.

The republican papers are indignant because Mr. Bryan said in a recent speech:

"There is a criminal law against the formation of a trust as well as against selling liquor without license, but while the administration prosecutes the man who sells a gallon of whisky without license it makes no effort to enforce the criminal law against the millionaires who conspire against the entire country. One trust magnate with stripes on behind prison bars will do more to kill the trusts than all the speeches the president has made."

What are the republican papers mad about? Do they deny the fact or the conclusion drawn from it? In the enforcement of the law the president discriminates between the poor and the rich. Do the republican papers object to the discrimination or to its being pointed out? The president favors publicity, which by itself means nothing, and a constitutional amendment, which, if good, could not be adopted for several years; why does he not try "equality before the law" and treat the violators of anti-trust laws as he treats lesser criminals?

### A Candid Confession.

The Omaha Bee is a republican paper. Its editor is Edward Rosewater, one of the shrewdest politicians and one of the best newspaper men in the west. In a recent issue of the Bee, commenting upon an article that appeared in The Commoner, Mr. Rosewater said:

William Jennings Bryan's latest trust remedy has some good ingredients, but his proposition to squelch the coal barons and suppress the trusts by calling a special session of congress is about as senseless as the proposition to settle the coal miners' strike by the Detroit conference. BRYAN CERTAINLY MUST KNOW THAT THE SENATE AS AT PRESENT CONSTITUTED WILL ENACT NO LAW THAT WOULD CURTAIL THE PRIVILEGES OR CONFLICT WITH THE INTERESTS OF THE COAL BARONS AND GIANT CORPORATIONS COMMONLY CALLED TRUSTS. An extra session of congress would, therefore, simply be a waste of money and energy.

It is interesting to observe that this republican paper admits that Mr. Bryan's suggestions have "some good ingredients," and it is also interesting

(Continued on Page 5.)