

BRYAN'S THREATS

Revolutionary Utterances of the Democratic Candidate for President.

What the Nebraskan Threatened to Do in His Campaign Speeches of 1896.

The Issue Now as It Was Then, Prosperity and National Honor.

Attack on the Gold Standard and Defense of the Supreme Court.

Secretary Gage has shown clearly the power which Bryan might use as president to nullify the gold standard law, if so disposed. Mr. Bryan has pledged himself in public speeches to use every power, regular and irregular, direct and indirect, to force the country upon a silver basis, if he is elected president.

Bryan gives in his book the full text of his speech in the campaign of 1896 to the business men of Chicago. In the report of this speech, since coolly and deliberately embodied in his book, on page 587, he says:

"And then I propose that we shall say to our foreign creditors that we intend to pay our coin obligations in either gold or silver. I propose that we shall say to them: 'Gentlemen, if you conspire to make that silver dollar less than the gold dollar, we shall pay you in that silver dollar.'

Bryan proposed a policy which was to be followed, not because of any supposed benefit to the country, but solely to secure revenge upon the foreign bondholder. He did not stop to consider the question of sawing off the limb on which the country is sitting and starting it down toward a silver basis by paying interest in silver.

In view of Mr. Bryan's threat to have it out with the bondholders it is significant to know that the threat of striking them over the shoulders of labor and industry was not confined to one speech or one occasion. Many times in the campaign he reiterated his determination to resort to extreme and even circuitous and irregular measures to attack the gold standard. Thus in his speech at Philadelphia (report on page 477 of his book) he boldly declared:

"I have said that if there was anybody who believed the maintenance of the gold standard absolutely essential, he ought not to vote for me at all. If I can prevent the maintenance of the gold standard, you can rely upon me doing it upon the very first opportunity that the people will give me."

It was no mere slip of the tongue which caused Mr. Bryan to speak of attacking the gold standard by irregular and extra-legal means. In an extraordinary speech made at Ottumwa, Ia., where he spoke of "the people taking the reins in their own hands," he said also (page 596 of his book):

"If I have behind me the hearts, as well as the votes, of the American people, you may depend upon it that no power in this country or any other nation will prevent the opening of our mints to the free coinage of silver on equal terms with gold and at the present ratio."

A moment later in that same speech he spoke of the people waiting until patience was exhausted, then arousing themselves and taking the reins of government into their own hands—a course transcending the law and appealing to the forces of revolution.

The full significance of these utterances is only to be understood when they are considered in the light of the still earlier and more formal one made at Madison Square (Bryan's book page 320) where he said:

"I shall always refuse to apologize for the exercise of the right to dissent from a decision of the supreme court." These are revolutionary doctrines, one and all. There is no lawful or constitutional power in this country coming from "the hearts of the people" as distinguished from their ballots. It takes a three-fourths vote to amend the constitution. Equally certain is it that holders of our bonds cannot be discriminated against and paid in a depreciated coinage. The supreme court would be bound to prevent any such action. Bryan, of course, knew that and hence the significance of his threat and warning to that tribunal.

Mr. Bryan knew as well in 1896 as he does now that some able lawyers have persistently claimed that, as a matter of mere legal duty, the supreme court would be compelled to declare against a change in the obligations of contracts from a gold standard to a silver basis. Bryan, of course, denies that, but is not content to stop there. He plainly means to "dissent from the decisions of the supreme court," not only in that instance, but in many others where that tribunal might feel bound to uphold the gold standard and the obligations of the law, as against the invocation of irregular and unauthorized powers derived from "the hearts of the people" and not from ballots cast in accordance with the constitution and the laws.

It would no doubt be dangerous for Bryan to nullify the gold standard law by paying the interest on bonds in silver, but he would have to belie his own utterances if he stopped there. The revolutionary programme which he proposes goes much farther than that. What is to be the response of law-abiding and law-respecting voters?

A PUNCTURED ARGUMENT.

Farmers Can Buy More with Their Produce Than They Could Four Years Ago.

The calamity press has lately copied rather extensively a series of so-called advances in prices on articles that farmers buy. The democrats are using the list in an attempt to show that the farmers pay the cost of prosperity.

Of course there is nothing in this when the statements are analyzed. It is true that there has been advance in certain articles, cleverly picked out by the democrats to urge their point, but in no instance has the advance been as great as the advance in price of what the farmer has to sell. In other words, the farmer is able to buy more with what he produces than he was four years ago, and he has the certainty of a first-class home market for everything that he can possibly produce.

Let us analyze these statements of the democracy.

If the Wilson bill was such a good thing for the people, it seems to us they should compare the 1900 with the '96 prices, and in all cases average prices should be the rule. The democrats say:

"Stoves have increased 30 per cent." Corn has advanced 50 per cent. and wages 40 per cent.

"Wages have increased from four to five dollars." Mules have advanced \$25 to \$50. "Nails have doubled in price." Wool has trebled in price since '96.

"Fourteen-inch plow that sold for ten dollars now sells for \$14." Before silver was struck down it took \$23 to buy that plow.

"Ropes that sold for five cents per pound now sell for 15 cents." Sheep that sold in '96 for \$2.60 now sell for four dollars.

"Binder twine which cost seven cents in '96 now sells for 11 cents." Poultry that sold for four cents in '96 now sells for eight cents.

"Barb wire has doubled in price." So has the Missouri mule; so has the raw material from which wire is made.

"Hoes, rakes, shovels and all such articles have gone up 40 per cent." Old iron from which these articles are made has advanced 150 per cent.

"Cultivators have increased three to four dollars." So have horses advanced \$15 to \$25.

"Common stove pipe which sold for ten cents now costs 20 cents." Hops which sold for seven cents now brings a ready sale at 16 cents.

"Bolts and rods have gone up 75 per cent." Flax has gone up 100 per cent.

Since 1897 there has been a general upward movement of commodities in this country, and this was the cry on the part of the silverites in 1896: "Give us free silver and prices will advance all along the line."

Statistics furnished by Bradstreet upon the basis of 100 staple articles in common use in this country shows that the average prices of these are now at the highest level known for years, and there has been a steady advance with an increase of 33 per cent. over the prices of July, 1896.

It is a notable feature of this advance that, whereas American farm and manufactured products have advanced, so has the price of labor, the prices of many staple articles in general use have declined.

HOW SOUTHERN EDITORS FEEL

Sentiment of Leading Journals Regarding Bryanism and Expansion.

Little by little the sentiment of the leading southern papers toward Bryanism and favoring expansion come to light. The Memphis Commercial-Appeal recently likened Mr. Bryan to a "blabberer," and now the editors of the Nashville Banner and the Atlanta Constitution have this to say about the facts:

"The thinking people of the south know that 16 to 1 was a concession to populism, and they know that Mr. Bryan's 'imperialism' is a phrase to juggle with—a campaign cry. Intelligent people in the south want expansion, and they believe in protection. Mr. McKinley has made no mistakes, except in a few instances in the appointment of postmasters."

—Leland Rankin, Editor Nashville American (Dem.).

"The south will go for Bryan. We are not imperialists, but we favor expansion. The south realizes that the retention of the Philippines will make for her profit more than for any other section of the country. I will say that President McKinley has many warm friends and admirers in the south."—W. A. Hemphill, Editor Atlanta Constitution (Dem.).

THE MILITARISM BOGY.

Size of Our "Large Standing Army" of Which the Democrats Rant.

Our "large standing army" of which the democracy is in such a state of fear consists of 65,000 men. Switzerland keeps nearly 2 1/2 times as many in her standing army of 148,000 men, and besides has 361,000 men in reserve.

The United States proportionately has the smallest army in the world. The ratio of soldiers to total population is shown by the following:

Country	Soldiers Per 1,000 Population.
France	44.06
Germany	41.05
Austro-Hungary	6.07
Russia	6.01
Turkey	7.01
Great Britain	5.03
Italy	7.01
United States	0.86

We do not have one soldier for every thousand people.

Kansas Has Good Times.
The deposits in the state banks of Kansas on December 24, 1895, were \$16,190,789.18. The deposits in the same banks on June 3, 1899, were \$33,505,101. Kansas, under the McKinley administration, has paid its debts and has money to lend.

Population.

1870.	38,558,371
1880.	50,155,783
1890.	62,622,250
1900.	78,000,000 (Estimated.)



"It Sort o' Looks as if Pd Have to Expand."

STRAWS.

There is an old saying—'all know it.' This not out of place then to blow it. To find out the course Of the wind, or its force, A straw will successfully show it.

The old proverb, I'm happy to say, is illustrated apt day by day: For in every newspaper Desertion's the caper From the party of mouthy Bill J.

The result of these straws, be it known, is that the G. O. party has grown; And as it has done before It will do once more, Which next fall will be very well known.

I am free to confess the great fact— The believers in which there's no lack— That the coming election Will be the selection Of Teddy and our own Billy Mac.

Then we'll forward! with never a break, For we very well know what's the stake; It is honor and fame Or a dishonored name For our country—that's why we're awake!

The Republican party remember And know when their beefsteak is tender, So let the Demos. and Pops. Continue their flops— The verdict will be right next November.

Then rally once more for the right! We still have the same foe to fight; Never look for a calm Till we carry the palm, And victory brings daylight from night.

The forthcoming election by all Will be an almost unanimous call For our worthy president To continue a resident Of the White House, by endorsement next fall!

WILLIAM M. PERKINS.

BRYAN ON THE FARMERS.

An Emphatic Refutation of the Popocrat Oracle's Insolent Assertions.

"Republican farmers, look at your wives, beset by 12 months of incessant toll each year. You can't take them to summer resorts and resting places. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves when you look at them, to vote the republican ticket."

—W. J. Bryan, in his Fort Scott Speech. So long as farmers are willing to allow themselves to be gulled by such political demagogues as you are, and pay you from \$500 to \$2,500 for a speech that is not worth 25 cents on the dollar, so long they will eat corn bread and wear wooden shoes. But what are the facts in the case? In our little bank at Walnut the individual deposits are \$43,988.25, which is nearly twice as much as they have ever been since we have had a bank. And what is so at Walnut is so in every bank in the state, and in every state in the union.

In the last two weeks two farmers near Walnut had sales to pay the mortgages on their farms coming due next spring. The sale of the one amounted to \$1,275, and \$800 of it was paid in cash. The other one's sale amounted to \$907.50, and he received \$800 in cash. When the sale was over they had nearly all the money in their hand and could deposit it in the bank and be ready to meet the mortgages when due. The rate of interest was low. At sales several years ago the rate of interest was high, and frequently there was not enough paid in to pay the auctioneer and for printing the sale bills. When the notes became due it was very difficult to make collections. This illustrates the difference in the times then and now among the farmers. The farmers come to town in buggies and carriages. They drive fine horses, have comfortable homes, plenty to eat and wear, and many of them have a nice bank account to their credit, and are not the paupers that you represent them to be.

—Walnut (Kan.) Eagle.

BRYAN FOR FREE WOOL.

Figures Which Answer the Democratic Candidate's Bold Declaration.

"It is immaterial, in my judgment, whether the sheep growers receive any benefit from the tariff or not. * * * I am for free wool."—W. J. Bryan, in Congress. The sheep raiser can answer Mr. Bryan's argument by quoting these figures:

State	Wilson Tar. (Free Wool)	Dingley Tar. (Protection)
Boston Quota	17c	30c
Ohio	17c	30c
Michigan	14c	25c
Terry, fine Delaine, clean	30c	50c
Terry, fine med. clothing	27c	50c
clean	27c	50c
Ken. 3/4 blood, clean	25c	45c
"I am for free wool," says W. J. Bryan.		

What say the wool producers? Carlisle Supports McKinley.

Hon. John G. Carlisle, who was secretary of the treasury under President Cleveland, and was speaker of the national house of representatives, has become the president of the Lawyers' Sound Money club, of New York. The club will support the reelection of President McKinley.

NOT A LOCAL ISSUE.

Bryan's Off-Hand Remark About Trusts and His Connection with Them.

At Pittsburg, Kan., while Mr. Bryan was discussing the trust question, some one in the crowd shouted an inquiry about the New York ice trust. Mr. Bryan replied that the ice trust is a local affair and concerns the people of New York.

Can he mean by this that a trust may be of the worst possible criminal character, like this ice trust, but so long as it is a "local affair" is none of his business, nor does not concern the American people?

In other terms, is it that the people of every community in the United States may be criminally squeezed by "trusts" and he will not care so long as the squeezing is only localized in each and every locality?

The principles of such philosophy are certainly broad enough to charitably cover not only every trust which specially oppresses one locality, like the New York ice trust, but also every one which localizes its operations to a particular section, like Senator Jones' cotton bale trust in the south.

According to this idea a trust like the Standard Oil company, in order to be like the ice trust and cotton bale trust, has only to go by different names, and take out different charters in different states or groups of states, so that its national operations are legally only a sum total of its local operations. Bryan will, however, in the case of the New York ice trust, find it difficult to localize interest in it to New York as Senator Jones finds it difficult to localize interest in his cotton bale trust to himself. The national democratic party made the "ice trust" a national issue when it delegated Van Wyck, one of the largest stockholders in it, to write the anti-trust plank. Bryan himself increased national interest in it as an issue by the recognition which he has given to Ice Trust Stockholder Croker, instead of to the non-ice holding element of New York democrats led by Hill and Coler.

In similar manner, the cotton bale trust has been given a national interest by the fact that Senator Jones, who made out of this trust the money which puts him in the St. Louis Globe Democrat's list of "Sixteen millionaires of Arkansas," was made chairman of the national democratic party.

Finally, it would be well to remember that Gen. Hancock, a splendid soldier, said in 1880 that the tariff was a local issue. He was buried beneath an avalanche of votes in consequence.

ARMY INTERFERENCE

Some Facts for Democratic Spell-Blinders to Peruse and Ponder.

While all this speechmaking is going on about the army and the danger of "militarism," it would be well to bear in mind the facts given below:

The army has never interfered but twice in labor troubles, and then after state resources were exhausted.

The first occasion was in the Debs trouble in Chicago in 1894.

The city government was powerless to stop the rioting, and John P. Altgeld, then governor, would not let the state militia be used.

Grover Cleveland, democrat, sent troops to Chicago, and the rioting was ended.

In the Coeur d'Alene district in Idaho mining troubles precipitated the rule of the mob.

The county authorities were helpless. Frank Steunenberg, twice elected as governor by the democratic-populist fusion element, called on the federal government for aid.

It was granted.

In neither case was there any interference by the national troops, who are in reality the national police, until the power of the local authority was gone.

Prosperity for Swine Raisers.
Live hogs were worth \$2.50 and \$3.70 in the Chicago stock yards in July, 1896. The price on October 3, 1900, was \$3.50 and \$5.60. The farmer is paid \$1.90 per hundred more for his choice hogs than he was in 1896, when the democrats were in control of the national policy.

REMEMBER!
"The democratic party stands where it did in 1895 on the money question."—William J. Bryan, at Zanesville, O., September 4.

AS TO THE ISLANDS.

Institutional Power to Alienate Territory Is Doubtful.

No Provision Made by the Framers for the Alleviation of the Philippines Even If Bryan Wanted to Aid Aguinaldo.

"There is no power under the law or the constitution by which congress or the president can dismember the Philippine islands from this nation. Congress cannot give them away, sell them to a foreign power or set up an independent government on these islands, as Mr. Bryan proposes to do. I have not seen this point raised yet by anyone, but Mr. Bryan, as a lawyer, ought to know the constitution of his country, and there is no authority anywhere in the constitution where an acre of our country can be dismembered from the jurisdiction of the United States. Such a thing never has been done, and it would take an amendment to our constitution to do what Mr. Bryan proposes.

"This is my opinion as a lawyer and I will put it against Mr. Bryan's or any other lawyer. This is a matter never yet passed upon by the supreme court, and depends wholly on the construction of section 3, article 4, of the constitution, which says: 'The congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.'

"I contend that this section does not give congress any authority to part with the jurisdiction of a single acre of our national territory. Congress has no right to sell or give away or convey a single acre to a foreign power, nor to set up an independent government on any acre of the public domain. This gives only general authority over our territory to dispose of them by dividing and naming them, surveying them, selling them to settlers, providing for local government and the enforcement of the laws, the protection of timber, locating of town sites, admitting them as states and exercising all acts of ownership and control and national jurisdiction, but absolutely no authority to part with national ownership and jurisdiction. It may exercise all acts of ownership, but cannot part with that ownership.

"Space will not justify an extended brief on this question, but I will put my opinion as a lawyer that our supreme court will so construe our constitution. That congress has no right to dissolve this union, or part with the jurisdiction of any part of our territory when once acquired. Successful revolution only can accomplish it.

"This is not an imperial government, though Mr. Bryan's ideas would make it so. Imperial governments dispose of their territory in that way when they please, but the territory of this country is held by and for the people, and jurisdiction once vested in our nation must forever remain until our constitution is amended, giving some authority for the dissolution of its territory.

"Every patriotic democrat should support McKinley in preference to Bryan. First, because every issue is virtually settled, and settled by the republicans on old democratic principles. The tariff and the money standards are not fundamental questions, but questions of policy, and the gold standard will likely stand the test of experience, and is, therefore, permanently settled. All parties now agree on a tariff sufficient to pay the expenses of government, laid lightest on necessities, and in such a way as to give the best protection to our own products and commerce. The only real question between the two parties is the fundamental one of expansion or anti-expansion. And on this the republicans stand on the old democratic principles of Jeffersonian expansion. Second, because McKinley has made the best president since Washington and Lincoln, and that under the most trying complications and difficulties, and shown himself a careful and able statesman. Third, because Bryan has proved himself to be a selfish politician, using his oratorical gifts at \$500 an hour or the gate receipts, and acting the part of a walking delegate of the labor trust in appealing to the restless, idle and dissatisfied elements, and flattering the workmen and plain people which is inconsistent with true dignity and statesmanship. Fourth, because his position on the Philippine question is inconsistent, unstatesmanlike and undemocratic. Fifth, because he is more of a populist than a democrat, and by the populist platform is bound to support the "initiative and referendum" and otherwise revolutionize our government. Sixth, because he represents such a conglomerate mass of discordant democrats, populists, greenbackers and extreme elements that he is not strong enough, and no man is strong enough, to control them, and if elected his administration would produce endless wrangling and discord and be worse even than Cleveland's last term. Respectfully,

GEORGE W. WARDER.
Kansas City.

Railway Men Know Good Times.
The Railway Employees' and Telegraphers' Political League has announced that the organization will drop the nonpartisan feature and will support McKinley and Roosevelt. It is expected that the organization will reach a membership of 350,000 before election day.

Farmers' Gain and Loss.
Farmers lost \$4,238,000,000 in the value of their crops in the years 1893-97 under free trade, or more than enough to pay the national debt twice over. The gain in value from 1897 to 1899 under the McKinley tariff was \$6,355,000,000.

SOUTHERN CLUB SETBACK.

Talk of Consent of the Governed in the Philippines by Democrats Is All Cant.

James S. Evans, a well-known merchant of Chicago, formerly of the south, has declined to join a "Southern Democratic club," now forming in Chicago. Below will be found his reason for declining to join:

Chicago, Sept. 25, 1900.—My Dear Sir: I thank you for your invitation to join the Southern Democratic club, the headquarters of which are at the Sherman house. At the same time I must respectfully decline to become a part of an organization the purpose of which is to assist Mr. William Jennings Bryan in reaching the highest office within the gift of a sovereign people.

"I come of a long line of democrats, many of whom have been conspicuous in the political history of the great states. From them I was taught the cardinal principles of true democracy; and, remembering these, I cannot subscribe to the teachings of Mr. Bryan and those candidates who are advocating them. Believing them to be dangerous to the people, and especially detrimental to the interests of the south, I shall cast my ballot against the Kansas City nominees and for the first time in the history of a member of my family vote the national republican ticket.

"The cry of imperialism raised by Mr. Bryan and his adherents, to my mind, is a canting hypocrisy. And it seems to me to be the very acme of insincerity for a southern democrat, such as you profess to be, to preach about individual liberty; the right of the governed to be consulted on matters of state issue, when all of us long ago agreed that the negro's place is inferior to the white man's on election days. Is it your wish to concede to the rebellious Tagalos greater individual liberty than we permit half of the population of the states of Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, North Carolina and Arkansas to enjoy?"

"At this moment, as you well know, every southern state that has not made previous provision for the disfranchisement of the negro is arranging to do so; and, no one of our section who believes in the right of the Anglo-Saxon to rule, is opposing.

"Were I to assist in a movement seeking to destroy the interests of the American government in the Philippines, placed there by a combination of circumstances this country could not honorably have circumvented; and subsequently consecrated by the blood of my kinsmen who fell fighting for the honor of their flag, I should feel as if I were a common traitor.

"A southerner by birth, in politics a democrat, an American by the grace of God, I shall, in the absence of a democratic nominee, vote for Mr. William McKinley, because he is something more than a man after an office. Very truly yours,

JAMES S. EVANS.
Mr. T. E. Powell, President Southern Democratic club, Chicago.

CONTRASTED WITH MEXICO.

Laborers in the Free Silver Republic Unable to Buy Provisions.

Free silver and its effects are best seen in contrast with conditions that prevail at El Paso, Tex. R. F. Campbell, who was one of the few republicans ever elected mayor of El Paso, supplies these comparative prices, which show how labor fares under free silver. It must be remembered that the Mexican prices are given in Mexican money:

	United States.	Mexico.
Day laborers	\$1.25 to \$2.00	\$1.00 to \$1.50
Miners	50 to 75	50 to 75
Bacon, per pound	11	20
Ham, per pound	15	20
Salt, per pound	1	1
Molasses, per gal.	55	2.50
Candles, per lb.	4	9
Sugar, per pound	6	15

The Mexican laborer receiving such small wages is unable to buy little if any provisions. In the words of the late Mexican minister Romero, "he will live on ten and twenty cents a day. Of course, he will have his little patch of corn, beans and chiles planted near his hut, and these form the largest part of his bill of fare three times a day for 365 days in the year. Five or ten dollars per year will clothe him, except perhaps his hat, and for that he will, if he can get the money, pay from five to twenty dollars."

Farmers know that with laborers living in that manner, the home market will be cut off. Free silver means a condition of distress among the working people of this country never before known. As long as the farmer knows the city wage-earners are satisfied, he knows that there will be good prices for all farm products. And that is why the farmers of this country are with the McKinley administration.

GLORY OF THE ARMY.

Some of the Hollow Phrases Uttered by Bourke Cockran at Chicago.

As a purveyor of nothings, Bourke Cockran is second only to Mr. Bryan. In a recent speech at Chicago he said: "The glory of American soldiers has not been in the greatness, but in the smallness of their numbers."

That sounds well in a speech, but what are the facts?
In the war of 1812 we had 85,000 regulars and 471,622 volunteers in the field.

In the Mexican war we had 39,954 regulars and 73,776 volunteers.

The civil war called for over 2,000,000 men.

The Spanish war brought out an army of 216,029 men.

There is nothing small about these figures. The glory of the American army, at all times, has been its unflinching courage, its high morale, its devoted patriotism. Its recent record in China is the last laurel which it has won.

Iron Production Doubles.

The production of iron, always a reliable trade barometer, has doubled since 1894, when free trade ruled the country. In that year we produced 6,637,388 tons. In 1899 the furnaces turned out 13,620,703 tons. Who would go back to the old scheme?

Hay Imports Dwindle.
We imported 302,652 tons of hay in 1896 under the Cleveland regime. In 1899 the imports were 19,872 tons. That is the difference between protection and free trade.