

Second Speech.

Following is Mr. Bryan's speech on the last night of the St. Louis convention supporting his amendment to the answer proposed to Judge Parker's telegram:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the convention: I will first read the amendment which I propose to the telegram, and then I desire to submit a few remarks in answer to some things which have been said. Here is the amendment:

"But as you will, if elected, be called upon to act on certain phases of the money question, we desire to know whether you favor reducing the volume of silver dollars, whether you favor an asset currency and branch national banks, and whether you prefer national bank currency to United States notes."

I wish to take up several matters, and I will take them up in order. I was willing in the committee to do everything possible in the interest of harmony, and I want you gentlemen to know that if there is discord in this convention, you can not lay it at my door. (Applause.) I have been the harmonizer. When they voted down my proposition to reaffirm the Kansas City platform, I did not present a minority report, and when we voted down their proposition for the gold standard and they did not present a minority report, we supposed that settled the matter. And my point now is that after we have done our part, after in the interest of harmony we have given up our contentions, they should not force upon us something worse even than their original proposition. (Applause.)

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Carmack) says he proposed a resolution, and I was willing to accept it. He read you part of it; let me read you all of it:

"We recognize that the great and unlooked for increase in the production of gold has relieved the stringency caused by the scarcity of metallic money, and that because of that fact the money question as presented in the last two presidential campaigns is not now acute and does not require legislative relief. But it has at the same time vindicated the demands of the democratic party in the past for an increased volume of metallic money, that demand not being for silver as silver or for gold as gold, but for a sufficient quantity of standard money to maintain the level of prices and transact the business of the country." (Applause.)

That was proposed by Senator Carmack as a substitute for the gold standard resolution offered by Senator Hill, and Senator Hill refused to accept it. I told him I would be satisfied with it if he would accept it. (Applause.) So in the interest of harmony—

Mr. E. W. Carmack of Tennessee: If the gentleman will permit me, that is not exactly correct. The Hill plank—

(At this point there was much disorder.)

Mr. Bryan: Do not interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. Carmack (to Mr. Bryan): You need not do that.

Mr. Bryan: If I make any mistake, I want to be corrected.

Mr. Carmack: I am much obliged to the gentleman, but I will say to him that he need not trouble himself to cause his friends to keep order while I address the convention. I will try to do that in one way or another.

The correction I want to make in the gentleman's statement is that the Hill plank had already been voted down by the committee, and I offered this as an independent resolution and he accepted it.

Mr. Bryan: My recollection, although I may be mistaken, because this covered several hours, is that when Senator Hill was speaking of the necessity of having something in the platform on that subject, this was proposed to meet the case, and I was willing to accept it; but Senator Hill refused to accept it. That resolution not only stated that it was not now acute and did not need relief, but it stated the principle for which we contended in two campaigns. And I wanted it in the platform. (Applause.) So much for that.

Something was said about my saying that Mr. Parker ought to be accepted as a platform. We were discussing platforms and several other things, and I suggested that we might not need any platform if we had a candidate whose record was known. I think it was in that connection that I suggested that the proper thing to do, if that was their plan, was to nominate Grover Cleveland, for he had such a record that he would not need any platform. (Applause.)

But, my friends, I think my recollection on the subject is corroborated by my question to Sen-

ator Hill and his answer that he did not know the opinion of Judge Parker. I think that verifies my position, for if Senator Hill did not know Mr. Parker's opinion, I would hardly say Parker himself ought to be accepted as a platform.

But I desire to refer to two or three arguments that have been made. It is said first that we ought to recognize the gold standard as the established law, that it is the established law. Why not recognize it? My answer is if this is the law, then why say anything about it? Shall we put in our platform a recognition of all the laws we have? If this is law, if we, therefore, ought not to object to it, then why is it necessary to state it?

Senator Daniel says that we have been defeated twice on the silver issue, and that we ought to acquiesce in the will of the majority. We have been defeated twice on the tariff issue. Why not acquiesce in the will of the majority there? (Applause.) Why resist the will of the majority? Why shall we array ourselves against "a settled public opinion" on the tariff question? This is not logic. And if it is true that we ought to accept the gold standard as established merely because we have been defeated on the issue in two campaigns, then by the same logic, we have no right to contest the protective tariff. (Applause.)

It is said that Judge Parker did not discuss this question and that nobody asked his opinion, because this question is so settled in New York that nobody ever thinks of mentioning it. If that is true, then how did anybody discover that it was not in the platform? (Laughter and applause.) If it is so well settled that they never think of it, that they never ask about it, that they never talk about it, then why are they so quick to discover its omission from the platform? (Applause.) It is not logical, my friends.

But, sirs, there is another question, and I speak of it with some emphasis. My friend here (Mr. Hamlin of Mass.) holds out before you people of the south the danger of black domination, and you are virtually threatened that, if you do not accept the gold standard, if you do not admit that it is irrevocably established, never to be interfered with, the people down east will let you suffer from your black peril. In 1896, when, as the candidate of the party, I had all the south behind me, and was speaking for things in which the south believed, my friend here (Mr. Hamlin) did not feel it necessary—and I do not speak it in censure—to join with us in order to help you out. (Applause.) Nor is he willing to admit now that the people of Massachusetts will join with you to save you from this peril unless you bow before their golden idol. (Applause.) I did better than his people will do. I told you that while I believed in the doctrine I have been preaching, I would support a gold standard man to help you out. I was willing to waive my position on that subject. (Applause.)

You were asked what difference it makes whether or not the man believes in the gold standard; whether or not his opinion is known, if he believes in it. The gentleman reminds you that I said I would support Governor Pattison, who is a gold man. I said I would. I told you he was a gold man. But, my friends, if we had nominated on that platform a man known to be a gold man, people could have gone and voted as I would have gone and voted—voted knowing that he was a gold man, but trusting him on the other questions. But now our candidate comes and injects into the platform this question, and makes it not merely a gold standard plank, but, as has been suggested, makes it an irrevocable gold standard proposition, denying us even the right to oppose it at a future time. The republican platform is not so strong on this subject as this telegram would make our platform.

There may be one advantage in having this brought out now; yes, two. One is that having nominated the candidate, it is very embarrassing to do anything that he objects to, and all of this feeling of embarrassment will help to fasten the gold standard on the party. That is one advantage in bringing it up now.

But, my friends, my objection to having this fight made in favor of the gold standard was that it would jeopardize the success of our campaign. I want us to win in this campaign. (Applause.) I want us to defeat the republican party; and I think it is infinitely embarrassing that this question should come in. I was rejoicing yesterday, I was exceeding glad, that a difference which I feared we might not be able to reconcile, had been reconciled, and it is distressing to me that this opposition must be met. What if the question is presented, what else can we do? Will you

drive us home like cowards and tell the people there that we did not dare to express ourselves? (Applause.) We have our people's interest to represent; we have their welfare to guard.

You have been told that it is to the east to which you must look. Some reference has been made to the Force bill. I think, if my memory serves me aright, that when the Force bill was before the senate, the south and the north and the east did not furnish democrats enough; they had to come west to get enough senators to save the south from the Force bill. (Applause.) We now have some senators from the northwest, and when the gold standard plank was before the committee and the question was asked, "Would its adoption do any harm," gentlemen arose not only from all the northwestern states, but from states north of the Ohio, and from states south of the Ohio, and declared that that plank would jeopardize success in those states.

We did not want this issue presented; we did not want this subject touched; but the action of the candidate has brought the subject in. I know but two ways of getting it out. One is so to amend this telegram to Mr. Parker as to state our side, not on dead issues, but on living ones; and the other is to amend your platform and put in a plank that will meet the case. If you want to amend your platform, I will agree now to Senator Carmack's plank. Will the friends of Judge Parker accept that as a sufficient declaration on the subject? (Applause.)

I insist that the question having been raised, you ought to meet it; you ought to meet it candidly; you ought to meet it fairly; you ought to meet it honestly. It is my candid opinion that an open, frank declaration will not lose you any more votes than an attempt to dodge this issue and to ignore it, now that it has been raised. (Applause.) And if the question of money is to be in the campaign, we should know the candidate's position on several questions. If this attempt to contract the currency by melting silver dollars is successful the administration can, by melting silver dollars, rob this nation of \$578,000,000 of its standard money, and thus take away from the people almost all the benefit that has come from the increased production of gold.

If the money question is in the campaign and we are to know that Judge Parker will put his veto to any attempt to interfere with the gold standard, we ought to know whether he is going to sign a bill which will give us an asset currency and make it so that we can not tell from day to day what is behind the dollars we carry in our pockets. (Applause.)

We ought to know whether he is going to put his signature to a bill which will give us a branch bank system and fasten upon this country a money monopoly like that which Jackson destroyed, and by destroying which made himself immortal in democratic history. (Applause.) These things we ought to know. We ought to know whether in this contest between government money and bank money our candidate stands on the side of the bank or on the side of the people. (Applause.)

If he had kept his views to himself on the gold standard question, we might have been willing to take our chances on the others, but now that you have him sure on your side on that subject, it is a little unfair to leave us uncertain as to his position on these other questions.

The Amendment Withdrawn.

Mr. Bryan: Allow me a word.

Mr. Williams: No, sir.

Mr. Bryan: I merely want to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. Williams: I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska for the purpose of withdrawing his amendment.

Mr. G. V. Menzies, of Indiana: Mr. Chairman—The Permanent Chairman: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. Menzies: In view of the fact that it is getting on to 1 o'clock, that the session has been prolonged and the delegates are tired and worn out, I think, sir, a motion to adjourn would be in order.

The Permanent Chairman: The motion is not in order at this time.

Mr. Menzies: I think a motion to adjourn is always in order.

The Permanent Chairman: A motion to adjourn is not in order when another motion is pending.

Mr. Menzies: It seems that nobody on the floor can get recognition.

Mr. Bryan: Mr. Chairman, I am going to