

WHAT WILL MR. BRYAN DO ABOUT SILVER?

We note some complaint among the newspapers of the north because Mr. William J. Bryan, of Lincoln, Neb., has declined to be interviewed by the correspondent of the New York Herald upon the question of silver. The Herald correspondent asked Mr. Bryan whether he would make payment in silver on government bonds, and on their face call for coin, and his reply was: "Mr. Bryan declines to be interviewed on this subject." The next night the same correspondent undertook the same task, putting various questions to Mr. Bryan, concerning his course about the finances should he be elected president next November. The only response the correspondent could get was:

"I will discuss public questions in my own way and in my own time."

This Mr. Bryan is the same Mr. Bryan who, in 1896, was nominated by the democratic party in Chicago as their candidate for president, who there denounced the demonetization of silver as an infamous and unpardonable crime, who declared that all other reforms wait upon financial reform; that the condition precedent to all prosperity was the free coinage of silver in the ratio of 16 to 1, and who defied the capitalistic classes, ridiculing their fears of a panic, and who said on the floor of the convention, in discussing the platform of the convention:

"If the gold standard is a good thing we ought to declare in favor of its retention and not in favor of abandoning it. If the gold standard is a bad thing, why should we wait until other nations are willing to help us let it go? Here is the line of battle, and we care not upon what issue they force the fight. We are prepared to meet them upon either issue or both."

Continuing, he said:

"You come to us and tell us that great cities are in favor of the gold standard. We reply that the great cities rest upon our broad and fertile prairies; burn down your cities and leave our farms, your cities will spring up again as if by magic; destroy our farms, and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country."

Furthermore, he declared: "No private character, however pure; no personal property, however great, can protect from the avenging wrath of an indignant people a man who will declare that he is in favor of fixing the gold standard upon this country."

There is no uncertain tone to a single utterance of Mr. Bryan in 1896. He defied the so-called capitalistic classes, he sneered at the plea for the prosperity of the cities, and when he had to answer the arguments of the Eastern leaders of the democracy, he said, turning to the gold delegates from New York and Massachusetts: "When you come before

us and tell us we are about to disturb your business interests, we reply you have disturbed our business interests by your course."

In view of this deliverance, followed with great consistency and unswerving purpose throughout the whole campaign, we fail to see how any man can doubt that, upon the 4th of March, 1901, should Mr. Bryan be elected president of the United States, he will at once issue an order to every officer of the government, requiring them to pay every coin obligation in silver dollars, coined at the ratio of 16 to 1.

In his Madison Square speech, made in the enemy's country to the business interests which at Chicago he had denounced, he said that "ruin waited upon the gold standard, and adherence to the gold standard would force gold abroad, and the only way to stop the flow of gold to Europe was to stop falling prices, and the only way to stop falling prices was to coin silver at the ratio of 16 to 1." And he added: "The interests of society demand a financial system which will add to the volume of the standard money of the world and restore stability to prices." In conclusion he said to them: "As the representatives of a great commercial city, you cannot afford to join the money changers in supporting a financial policy which by destroying the purchasing power of the products of toil must in the end discourage the creation of wealth."

At Rhinebeck Mr. Bryan was equally emphatic upon the questions which he now refuses to discuss with the correspondent of the New York Herald. He said: "We believe that while the struggle for gold goes on, other things must become cheap, but as we increase the demand for that one thing, gold, it must decrease the price of all those things which are exchanged for gold. We believe that the falling of prices, compelled by legislation, is destructive of energies, industries and hope of the toiling masses of the United States and of the world."

It is hardly worth while to cite further utterances of Mr. Bryan; they are too well known and have become a part of the records of our political history. We all know what Mr. Bryan would have done in 1896 on the day he was inaugurated. The party, or rather, the Eastern portion of the democratic party, in 1900 desired to have from Mr. Bryan not a recantation, but a submission to the lessons of experience, some concession from him concerning the financial situation; some admission on his part that he was not still wedded to the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1, without waiting for the assistance of any other nation.

Mr. David B. Hill, who opposed the Chicago platform in 1896, pleaded earnestly with Mr. Bryan in 1900 at

Lincoln for this concession, for this modification, even in verbal form, but he pleaded in vain.

Mr. Bryan told him that if the democratic party changed a single letter in its platform, modified a single expression, failed specifically to reaffirm its faith in the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1, he would not accept its nomination.

Mr. Bryan had his way. The platform was written as he wanted it, and he was nominated. He is the candidate of the party on that platform today; it is a reflection upon his honesty of purpose; a reflection upon his personal integrity; a reflection upon his political consistency to intimate that if he were elected president he would give force and effect immediately by an executive act to the position of the party upon expansion, but that he would fail, he would refuse, he would hesitate to give a like effect to the position of the party upon the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1. —Louisville Post.

DENBY AGAINST BRYAN.

Hon. Charles Denby, former United States Minister to China and a life-long democrat, is against Bryan. Mr. Denby was appointed minister to China by president Cleveland. He was later appointed by president McKinley a member of the first Philippine commission. His opinions are entitled to special consideration as they are the result of careful study and observation right on the ground. Mr. Denby has given out the following statement for publication:

Bryan Favored the Treaty.

"In his speech of April 17, 1900, in the senate, Mr. Hoar said he could not forget that Mr. Bryan, 'unless he is much misrepresented, used all his power and influence with those of his friends who are ready to listen to his counsels to secure the ratification of the treaty,' meaning the Paris treaty.

"There were 17 democratic senators who voted for the ratification. A two-thirds majority was necessary. The treaty was ratified by one vote. Mr. Bryan has squarely assumed the responsibility of the ratification.

"In his speech of acceptance Mr. Bryan meets this question in the only way that he could have met it. His language is: 'I was among the number of those who believed it better to ratify the treaty'. * * * Thus Mr. Bryan indorses the doctrine that a politician has the right to do evil in order that good may come. The end justifies the means. In morals this position is unsound.

Aguinaldo Created the War.

"We had taken Manila on August 13, 1898. In December, 1898, Spain had made a treaty ceding the islands to us. We had occupied them until February 5, 1899. On that day Aguinaldo made