

Direct answer to that question, I should be inclined to say, "yes, it is time."

Mr. Bynum. And quit humbugging.

Mr. Bryan. Yes; and of all the humbugs that the farmer has to contend with, the greatest humbug is the man who objects to restraining legislation whenever the farmer is to be the beneficiary.

Mr. Williams, of Mississippi. And who sneers at a measure because the farmers want it.

Mr. Bryan. Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have had this doctrine of "non-interference" preached to us until it is getting to be quite familiar now. But we understand that whenever any great corporation comes here and wants something, the doctrine of "non-interference," is not by any means so emphatically proclaimed. It is only when we attempt to do something that interferes with the practices of corporations that objection is made.

Mr. Tawney. Does the gentleman's remark apply to the sugar trust?

Mr. Bryan. Yes, sir, it does; and I want to say to my friend from Minnesota (Mr. Tawney) that I do not like the bill which the senate is about to give us (applause on the democratic side), although it gives to the sugar trust less advantage than the McKinley bill, which your people passed, gave to it.

Mr. Haugen. Will you vote for it?

Mr. Bryan. I will vote to cut it down just as much as I can.

A Member. And to cut it out?

Mr. Bryan. To cut it down and cut it out. I am going to try to make that bill as good as possible. But, sir, the senate will have to do exceedingly bad work with that bill if it is not a great deal better than the law which is now upon the statute book. (Applause on the democratic side.)

Now, Mr. Chairman, I only rose to address the committee briefly. I thought I was going to finish my remarks in ten minutes, and would have done so had not other points been brought out by the interruptions. But I simply want to leave this proposition to be thought of by those who are considering this bill, and to be answered by those who are opposing it; first, if speculation affects the price of the product speculated in—

Mr. Goldzier. Does it?

Mr. Bryan (continuing). What right has the speculator to affect that price?

Mr. Goldzier. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Do you assert that it does, one way or the other, affect the prices, and if so, I ask the gentleman to furnish the proof.

Mr. Bryan. I presume the gentleman from Chicago will discuss this question. I am anxious he should, for I am sure he will present all that can be said on his side of it with a great deal of intelligence, and in that time he can spread on the records of the house any conclusive proof that he has that gambling in farm products does not affect the price either way.

Mr. Goldzier. I have none, but the onus probandi lies on you. You seek the enactment of a law to suppress gambling in these products, which you say affects the price. Now I call on you to produce the proof of that fact.

Mr. Bryan. Mr. Chairman, I affirm, on information and belief, that gambling in such products does affect the price, and I will state why I so believe. I believe it because when you get together a large amount of money and invest it that way it is possible to raise or lower prices; and if that is possible, I have just enough confidence in the retention of human nature by the men on the boards of trade to believe that what they can do with their money they will do. But it is not necessary to rely on presumptive evidence entirely. I am not compelled to base my argument on the fact that it is possible to affect the price and that, therefore, it is probable that the price will be affected. I can point to the fact that, time and time again, it has been done; that, time and time again, men have, by speculation on the board of trade, raised prices or lowered them, entirely independent of the law of supply and demand.

When we show that it can be done, when we show that according to human nature it will in all probability be done, and when we show that it has been done often, we have presented enough proof, at least until our opponents offer some evidence on their side.

Mr. Harter. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a question? I understand the gentleman to say that speculation in grain has time and time again raised the price above the proper rate in the markets of the world. Will the gentleman kindly give us the country and the dates when this was done?

Mr. Bryan. I do not remember that in the brief remarks I have made today I have made

any such statement as the gentleman from Ohio puts in my mouth. What I have said is this: That I do believe—and the facts, as well as the logic, of the the situation justifies the belief—that on innumerable occasions speculation on boards of trade in the price of products has affected the price of the products speculated in. What I desire is to eliminate, so far as legislation can eliminate them, such elements of uncertainty as grain gambling contributes.

Mr. Allen. Will the gentleman let me ask him a question?

Mr. Bryan. Certainly.

Mr. Allen. I wish to ask if the gentleman has not read that argument—I have, at least—an argument showing that this speculation has increased the price, and therefore it is to the benefit of the farmer altogether.

Mr. Harter. There is no question of that.

Mr. Bryan. Does the gentleman from Ohio believe that?

Mr. Harter. That that is a legitimate effect?

Mr. Bryan. Yes.

Mr. Harter. I certainly do.

Mr. Bryan. The gentleman from Ohio, who has been representing a district agricultural to some extent, is now, I believe, going to become a resident of Philadelphia, and I would like to know how he will justify before the people of that city who buy wheat, a policy, plan, or process which will make them pay more for the wheat than they could otherwise be compelled to pay.

Mr. Harter. Does the gentleman really desire an answer?

Mr. Bryan. Yes, sir; in a word.

Mr. Harter. Well, I will answer it tomorrow. But briefly, now: The "gentleman from Pennsylvania or Ohio" would not by law raise the price of grain, nor would he be willing to reduce it, but he would allow every American citizen the privilege of buying or selling as he pleased, and leave the consequences, whether there would be an increase or decrease of price, to the legitimate laws of trade.

Mr. Bryan. I must differ from the gentleman from Ohio. My position is this: If two men are betting as to which can spit the nearest to a crack in the floor, and the floor belongs to them, I may not be justified in interfering; but when their betting affects the price of a product which my people either use or produce, and by that betting increase the price to the consumer or decrease the price to the producer, I am justified in interfering. I believe such gamblers ought to be restrained just as much as if these speculators waited until the farmer sold his wheat, and then by stealth or force took the money from him, if the price is reduced, or waited until the consumer labored and earned his wages, and then took from him that portion which would be measured by the increased price, if the price is raised.

That states the difference between the gentleman from Ohio and myself on that proposition, perhaps as clearly as I can state it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will not delay the committee longer. I was recapitulating. It is necessary either for the people who are opposed to this bill to prove that gambling does not affect prices, either to the consumer or to the producer, or if it does, to justify that interference with natural laws. If they admit that that interference is unjust and ought to be regulated, then they must advocate regulation either by the state or by the federal government. If they will secure regulation by the state government which will be effective, well and good; but, Mr. Chairman, I for one am not willing to withhold the strong hand of the general government at the request of those people who plead for state restraint, and yet, who exercise all the influence they have to prevent the state government from doing the very thing which they ask you to leave to the state.

We find a great deal of complaint in the country now. We find criticism of various laws, and sometimes criticism of bad laws is erroneously construed into a criticism of government itself. But, sir, it was said by Andrew Jackson—and I had the honor to quote it a few days ago—that "there are no necessary evils in government. Evils exist only in its abuses." The abuses of government may exist either in special legislation, which gives to one man an advantage over his fellow men, or they may exist in the refusal of government to exercise the restraining powers which are imposed upon it when it takes from the individual the right to defend himself.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that if we would take the Declaration of Independence and apply its principles to every proposition brought before us; if we would measure every piece of legislation by its principles, we could distribute

the blessings of government equally throughout all the land. And insofar as my judgment will lead me aright, I desire to join the members on this side of the house or on the other side of the house, in passing such laws, first, as will restrain every man from injuring his fellow-man, in order that each may be permitted to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Not that we in that way can take away the differences between men. So long as there are differences in physical strength, in character, in intellectual ability, in industry, and in habits, there will be differences among men. But, sirs, we can prevent the government from exaggerating the differences which it needs. We prevent government from giving to those who have and from taking from those that have not. By the strong arm of the law we can restrain man from inflicting upon his fellow-man any injury dictated by that selfishness which must ever be restrained, if man is to be fit for society and citizenship. (Applause.)

EXTEND THE EDUCATIONAL WORK

Amsterdam, N. Y., April 17.—I am personally much interested in the educational series which you have in your great weekly, but here in the east where your ideas are not understood, where the greatest needs for political education are unfulfilled, the democratic party has no newspapers and even the news agencies hold back your paper, making it almost impossible to procure a copy.

Now for one thing, I would think that if you could get these small democratic papers to run that series, of course after the entire course has run in your paper, it would reach thousands of voters who never would or could be reached in any other way. It was the political ignorance, the hold that large republican manufacturers and merchants, through the medium of advertising; it was this hold over the small democratic dailies that made them disloyal or only half-hearted; these different reasons caused your defeat in the east last fall.

Now, Mr. Bryan, this is not meant for publication in your paper, but is written entirely out of friendship, as you are my ideal in American public life, the man who would rather be right than president. I am a young man, financially poor, or I would attempt to do something more for you and the cause than this, but at least you have my heartfelt wishes.

A. D. ANDERSON.

"THE MASTER'S VOICE"

In its issue of Wednesday, April 21, the Philadelphia North-American, a republican paper, prints a long editorial entitled "The Master's Voice." In this editorial the North American denounces Senator Aldrich, the republican leader.

The North American says that although Rhode Island is the tiniest state in the union, its senator "lays down the law to ninety million of Americans in forty-five commonwealths, almost every one of which is an empire by comparison with Rhode Island."

The North American says: "But when the Rhode Island corner grocer Aldrich made as much of a statement as he cared to make about what he proposes to allow this country to have in the way of a tariff, the representatives of a supposedly free people listened reverently to his insolent ultimatum. For Aldrich does not speak for Rhode Island. Through him speak Wall Street and Standard Oil and every one of the moneyed powers of prey."

But Aldrich also speaks for the republican party and the North American, as well as other republican papers that now protest, had every reason to know that the triumph of republicanism meant the triumph of Aldrichism.

The North American says that on the tariff question Mr. Aldrich is "playing the same swindling game that he played last year with the currency." And the North American concludes thus: "We shall see to what extent Aldrich of Rhode Island can make of the president a nullity and of the republican party a pledge-breaking liar." The editor of the North American is simple, indeed, if he expected from Mr. Aldrich any other attitude than he now assumes. He is simple, indeed, if he expects a political party that derives its campaign funds from highly protected trusts to do anything against the special interests of its benefactors. He is simple, indeed, if he does not know that, as a republican leader, Aldrich towers above them all and that Aldrichism is the real spirit of the republican party.