

question: "We demand the free coinage of silver on equal terms with gold, and denounce the efforts of the republican party to serve the interests of Wall street as against the rights of the people." Just before the adoption of this plank about nine-tenths of the democrats of the house of representatives had voted to recommit the Sherman silver bill with instructions to report a free coinage bill.

In 1892, two years after the adoption of this congressional platform, the democratic national platform contained a plank in favor of the use of "both gold and silver as the standard money of the country," and in favor of the "coinage of both gold and silver, without discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage." The principle of bimetallism was thus stated, but the plank of 1892 contained a postscript which was unfairly construed to nullify the declaration in favor of the double standard. Prior to 1890 the democratic party in the house and senate had voted almost unanimously in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of sixteen-to-one, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation, and the plank in Mr. Bryan's platform was in entire harmony with the uniform policy of the party. Bimetallism is not a new thing. This nation had the double standard without interruption from the year 1792 to the year 1873. During all that period there never was a day when the holder of silver bullion could not have his silver coined into full legal tender money at a fixed ratio with gold. From 1782 to 1834 the ratio was fifteen to one, from 1834 to 1873 it was sixteen to one, but the change in the ratio did not interfere with the full operation of the bimetallic system. At one time the coinage of silver dollars was suspended, but the free coinage of silver into coins of less than a dollar was continued, and these coins were at that time a full legal tender. A change was made in the fineness of our coins in 1837 and later subsidiary coin was made a limited legal tender, but the principle of bimetallism was never interfered with. Not only were the principles of bimetallism understood in this country, but they were understood in other countries, the subject having been discussed at international conferences attended by the most prominent men of Europe and America. The principles of monetary science are well settled and they do not change with the seasons. While an increased production of gold has for the time being made the money question less acute, it has in no way affected the arguments that lie at the foundation of the subject.

There are two advantages in bimetallism—one theoretical and the other practical. If the world could have as much of either metal as it now has of both metals a single standard of either metal while supplying the same quantity of money would lack the advantage which the world has derived from the use of both metals, namely, the advantage of greater stability in the purchasing power of the monetary unit. In the history of the world there have been several periods of increase in the gold product and several periods of increase in the silver product, but never a period when there has been a large increase in the production of both metals at the same time. These alternating increases have, therefore, had less effect upon the world's volume of metallic money and less effect upon the purchasing power of the unit than they would have had, had both metals increased in production at the same time. The practical advantage of bimetallism is that gold and silver together furnish more money than gold alone, and the world today is using some \$4,000,000,000 of silver along with about an equal amount of gold, and besides using more than \$8,000,000,000 of gold and silver together it is also using a large amount of uncovered paper and bank notes. Mr. John G. Carlyle, then a congressman from Kentucky, said in 1878 that the world would be fortunate indeed if the supply of gold and silver together kept pace with the demand for money. There would be no difficulty today in using all of the increased production of gold in the retirement of uncovered paper, without retiring a single dollar of silver.

When Mr. Bryan admits that the increased production of gold has been an advantage to the world, when he admits that by gift of Providence—if it is attributed to Providence—or by act of the miners—if they deserve the credit—the country is now in less urgent need of bimetallism than it was eight years ago, he has admitted all that the facts require. There is no reason why he should favor the acceptance of the gold standard as a finality, and there is certainly no reason why he should be in favor of putting the government in the hands of those who denied the quantitative theory of money in 1896 and who now look at the money

question as if it concerned only the financiers and not the public at large.

Those who believe that the volume of money should keep pace with the demand for money, and who insist that we shall not by legislation bring upon the country the injustice of an appreciating standard of money—these can more safely be trusted with the financial policy of the country than those who would run the treasury department as an asset of the Wall street financiers, and then collect campaign funds in return for the favoritism shown by the government.

Mr. Bryan has referred to his platform of 1890 to show that in the fourteen years that have passed since that time he has not had reason to change his attitude on public questions. Since 1890 he has added the income tax to the list of reforms, and he still believes that it presents a just principle of taxation. The income tax increases with the income and the taxpayers' burden is, therefore, in proportion to his ability to pay, as well as in proportion to the advantages which he enjoys under the protection of the government.

Since 1890 the labor question has become an issue, and the same general principles that lead Mr. Bryan to oppose a tariff which taxes all the people for the benefit of a few of the people and to oppose the trusts that prey upon the public; the same general principles that lead him to oppose a financial system that bleeds the public for the benefit of the money changer and the owner of fixed investments; the same general principles lead him to favor legislation which will protect the laboring man in the enjoyment of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

The question of imperialism has also been brought into the arena of politics and he applies to this question the same general principles that he has applied to others. Imperialism taxes the people of this country to maintain a colonial system while a few syndicates exploit the islands. Without imperialism the republican party would not have dared to raise a standing army. The increase in the army alone makes an annual addition of more than \$50,000,000 to the taxes that the people must pay. Without imperialism the republicans could not defend the increase that they have made and which they proposed to make in the size of the navy. This increase already adds another \$50,000,000 or more to the burdens of the people. It is not an exaggeration to say that imperialism is now costing us \$100,000,000 a year, or some \$6 for each family. The only return we get from this outlay is the shame of an abandonment of the doctrine of self-government, the danger that those principles will be applied to us and the reaction upon our own national character.

The Baltimore News says that Mr. Bryan's consistency is "carried to a point so extreme as to amount to something abnormal, something offensive to a wholesome political instinct." Is there anything abnormal in the application of a well-settled principle to public questions? Jefferson's maxim "equal rights to all and special privileges to none" is of universal application. Why should we apply it to some questions and ignore it in our consideration of others? Lincoln's doctrine of a government "of the people, by the people and for the people" was of universal application. Why should we consider it in the consideration of some questions and disregard it in the consideration of others? The commandment, "Thou shalt not steal" is no less universal. It ought not to seem strange to any one that a citizen, whether in public life or in private life, should maintain a consistent course and refuse to deviate from it no matter how tempting the temporary advantage promised. Good character in the individual is nothing more than habitual righteousness. No man can establish a character worth having if he is guided in each business transaction solely by the amount that he can make. He must be guided by rules that compel him to deal justly with his fellows.

And so with party, good character is habitual righteousness. A party suffers whenever it departs from its principles in the hope of winning a temporary success. The result usually is that it not only fails to win the success—the winning of which it put above all other things—but that it loses time that ought to have been employed in the work of education. A man must be consistent, and the necessity of consistency in a party is no less imperative. If this year the democratic party had earnestly and courageously continued its fight for reform it would have made a better showing than it did. If the democratic men and democratic newspapers which since 1896 have been denouncing the party's reform program had joined in and presented the arguments that can be made in behalf of these reforms our party today would be

very much stronger than it is, if not in actual possession of the government. If, however, the experiences through which we have passed have been necessary to convince our eastern democrats of the wisdom of a positive and consistent course, the uses of adversity may, after all, prove sweet and we may now, without bitterness or upbraiding, undertake the great work that lies before us.

Progress in Russia

The press dispatches from St. Petersburg report a growing agitation in favor of parliamentary government. A meeting was held in Russia, under the protection of the new secretary of the interior, at which a resolution was adopted by a vote of 105 to 3 declaring in favor of a legislative body to make the laws of the country. One of the principal speakers had for twenty-four years been an exile. Meetings are being held all over the country to give voice to the unanimous desire of the people for a direct share in the government. The press dispatches say that the situation is unparalleled and that nothing approaching such a movement has been permitted in Russia. The interest in this movement is said to overshadow even the war, and it is reported that the liberals are flocking to St. Petersburg from all parts of the empire, including Poland and Finland. The hotel lobbies are crowded, it is said, and the scene resembles convention times in America. This is certainly encouraging news from Russia. The two great obstacles to progress in Russia are lack of education among the masses and autocratic government. The educational facilities are being constantly enlarged, and the percentage of illiteracy constantly decreases. This, in itself, has a great bearing upon the future of Russia. There has been evidence also of progress along governmental lines. Nearly two years ago the Czar issued a decree promising a measure of local self-government. In St. Petersburg a municipal election was held about a year ago with an enlarged franchise. Since then the czar has recalled the exiles and given evidence that there is to be a change in policy in this respect.

And now comes the meeting of liberals, held under the protection of the secretary of the interior, to give expression to the desire of the people for representative government.

The war is not yet over; so far the advantage is with the Japanese, but even if the tide should turn the czar can not by any possible victory over the Japanese add to his own fame or benefit his people as much as he can by establishing a responsive and responsible government. When an autocratic ruler gives away some of his power it is a "giving that doth not impoverish," and when he withholds from the people that which is rightfully theirs he is not enriching himself. If the Japanese war, with the troubles and perplexities attendant upon it, leads the czar to consider favorably the petition of his subjects and admit them to a share in the responsibility of government, the war will be worth to Russia more than it has cost.

Republican Advice

Under the title "More Free Advice" the Kansas City Journal recalls the advice that it has given to the democratic party, and ventures to furnish another installment. The Journal names its favorite democratic candidate for 1908, and says that if he is put in nomination he will give the republican nominee "a hard run" and will even beat him should the latter be "a bad or weak man." It will be remembered that the republican papers were very generous with their advice last spring. They were unselfish enough to point out to unwary democrats "the way to win." They dwelt with affected sorrow upon the defeats of 1896 and 1900 and attributed them to the fact that the party did not have the confidence of the "business elements." They pretended a sincere desire to so strengthen the democratic party as to make it a strong competitor with the republican party. They did not exactly promise victory to the reorganizers, but assured them that by following a conservative course they could make the democratic party a strong and influential force in politics. These republican suggestions were quoted with approval by that portion of the corporation press which, that it may better deceive the public, calls itself democratic.

Judge Parker was the favorite candidate of these papers, and his praises were sung loud and long. When he was nominated the republican pa-