

# The Conservative.

VOL. II.

NEBRASKA CITY, NEB., THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1899.

NO. 22.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

OFFICES: OVERLAND THEATRE BLOCK.

J. STERLING MORTON, EDITOR.

A JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE DISCUSSION OF POLITICAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIOLOGICAL QUESTIONS.

CIRCULATION THIS WEEK 7,075 COPIES.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

One dollar and a half per year, in advance, postpaid, to any part of the United States or Canada. Remittances made payable to The Morton Printing Company.

Address, THE CONSERVATIVE, Nebraska City, Neb.

Advertising Rates made known upon application.

Entered at the postoffice at Nebraska City, Neb., as Second Class matter, July 29th, 1898.

## LOOK BACK.

The deluded democrats who repudiated President Cleveland and his strong and brave advocacy of the gold standard should now look back to the beginning of their recusancy. At its initiation the republicans, who had sense, observed the path for that organization to take. They saw that sound money would win out even to the White House in 1896. They adopted the monetary views of the Cleveland administration; they picked up the solid truths in finance, which a misled democracy had repudiated, and with those truths at the front won the presidency over Bryanarchy.

Before doing this wise thing, however, the republican leaders did a wiser one; they ignored the silver fallacies of Allison, Sherman and McKinley. Each one of those distinguished republicans had spoken for a silver-favoring currency. Mr. McKinley, while a congressman, had voted to pass the Bland-Allison act over the logical and patriotic veto of President Hayes. After that, between the years 1893 and 1897, at various places, McKinley assaulted President Cleveland for his attitude antagonizing the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1. But the leaders of the republicans shut out from view all these records of Allison, Sherman, McKinley and other prominent shouters for silver who voted for and advocated the Bland-Allison abomination of 1878.

Hanna and other sagacious men of affairs sent to the rear the records and personal efforts of all republicans who had ever been tainted with money fallacies.

Among the records thus buried from sight not one was more pronouncedly

pro-silver than that of William McKinley. But he renounced his record, his exhortations, his faith, and accepted a nomination for the presidency on a platform which proclaimed unequivocally the gold standard—the gold standard which Grover Cleveland adhered to, which near-sighted democrats rejected and shallow, callow statesmen condemned. Upon that gold standard platform McKinley was elected, notwithstanding that up to the day of his nomination his record had been as pro-silver as the record of Richard Bland.

The democrats of the South whom Grover Cleveland emancipated and restored to citizenship—the democrats of the West and Northwest whom he encouraged and strengthened and who, after all that, followed off the vagaries and fallacies of Bryanarchy, can now look back and observe what egregious fools they have been as mere partisans and what colossal blunderers as patriots! Look back, and during the four years of the second administration of Grover Cleveland, behold lost opportunities—opportunities for successful partisan organization and for patriotic endeavor; opportunities rejected, thrown away by the leading knaves and prominent fools of the then democratic party, then in congress.

WELLMAN  
AN ILLMAN.

THE CONSERVATIVE has a personal regard for many manly traits which characterize Walter Wellman, arctic explorer and Times-Herald correspondent at Washington. But Wellman becomes an illman when he attempts to belittle Grover Cleveland because he as president of the United States sent advisory messages to Congress in accordance with the Constitution, which among other duties of the President, provides that (see Article 2 Section 3): "He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

In his November 30, 1899, letter Mr. Wellman remarks to the readers of the Times-Herald:

"I hear that the President's message is not to be a sensational or 'leading' paper. By this is meant that he has few definite suggestions to make to congress. He narrates the events of the year, gives information, and leaves

the initiative to congress. As a history of the past year the country will find the message clear and admirable. If the country expects to read in it much of definite plans for solving the money problems with which the government is confronted it will be disappointed.

Why should the President imitate one of his predecessors, Grover Cleveland by name, and try to put congress in leading strings in his message? Our lawmakers never like much of that sort of thing from the executive end of the avenue. Besides, it is fortunate that just at this time there are easier ways for the President to secure desired results at the capitol. For the first time in years the house and senate and the executive mansion are sure to work well together. As these things are done nowadays the message is for the country. There are other avenues of communication with congress."

The fact that McKinley "has few definite suggestions to make to congress" will astound nobody. "Definite suggestions" from an indefinite individuality are not expected. Again, saith Wellman: "If the country expects to read in it much of definite plans for solving the money problems with which the government is confronted it will be disappointed."

After the promise to establish and maintain the gold standard, made by the republican candidate of 1896, and asserted by his party in national convention, the country, if it did not know McKinley as an original free silver man who voted in 1878 to pass the Bland-Allison abomination over the veto of President Hayes—might rationally have expected "definite plans for solving the money problems." But no posted person, who knows the oleaginous smoothness and perfect neuter-genderism of the unctuous and truly pious McKinley, expected anything straightout, and up-and-up, either on the money question or any other question. An executive Pecksniff or Chadband will never "imitate Grover Cleveland" and "try to put congress in leading strings." No clam will ever successfully imitate a locomotive and a whole train of cars attached thereto.

"Our law-makers never like much of that sort of thing from the executive end of the avenue." That is true. Many law-makers like nothing which the constitution of the United States provides for. But when Wellman criticises Cleveland for having, under his oath of office, obeyed the constitution, he appears an ill man.