

ture. It has not been my good fortune to read all of his speeches in the present campaign. It may be, therefore, in some speech which I have not read that he has explained how it is that a doctrine is true in Luzon which is not true in North Carolina.

HARRY PRATT JUDSON.

THE SALT TRUST.

Speaking of the charge that the salt trust is a monopoly, Mr. Joy Morton of Chicago, who is one of its principal officers, said last night.

"Any one of twenty-six states in this union has enough salt to supply the world, and there is no reason why any man or company should not commence the manufacture of salt in any one of these states at any moment that he desires to do so. Salt is as plentiful as water. Its value depends entirely upon its location with reference to a market, because two thirds of the price paid by the consumer represents the transportation. The value of the salt in the mine is merely nominal—1 cent, 2 cents or 3 cents a hundred pounds. As raw material it is worth no more than scrubbing sand, or the sand of which glass is made. Outside the mine, ready for shipment, salt is worth from 10 to 15 cents a hundred weight, according to the location. Half of that amount represents the cost of the fuel consumed in mining and purifying it; the rest represents labor. Salt sells at wholesale by the barrel at from 25 to 35 cents a hundred pounds, according to the distance it has been transported. The retailers get very little profit on the ordinary salt, but the finer qualities of table salt, which are refined by various processes, sell at fancy prices. This fine salt bears the same relation to ordinary commercial salt that confectionery bears to sugar, and the price depends upon the manner and style in which it is put up, the name of the refiner and the man who sells it."—W. E. Curtis in the Chicago Record.

GEN. BRAGG REPUDIATES BRYAN. EDITOR CONSERVATIVE:

I have delayed, as I ought not to have done, answering your note, which came in my absence from home a good while since, requesting me to express my opinion as a democrat on the present political situation.

You made no mistake in thinking that I adhered to the doctrines of the old party to which we both belong, and was not liable to be side-tracked by any false lights that might be hung out on either side. My delay was the result, largely, of an undetermined question in my mind, whether it were better for me to write or to speak. I have now determined, upon the request of a large number of national gold democrats, in Milwaukee, to speak in that city during the next week, in which I shall proclaim

my faith in the fathers of the democratic party and their doctrines, and my refusal to be seduced by any specious pretense or promise, into the support of the populist doctrines, which I thoroughly abhor, and regard as destructive of the great party which you and I have insisted all our lives, notwithstanding any errors it may have committed, as being the rock of salvation for the perpetuity of the Republic.

ED. S. BRAGG.

Fond du Lac, Wis., Oct 3, 1900.

A GOOD DESCRIPTION OF BRYAN.

William M. Ivins, a New York gold democrat, intends to vote for McKinley. In the letter in which he says he is going to do so he states with much force the reasons why Bryan is unfit for the presidency. The only credentials of this man, who is seeking the highest place in the gift of the people, are, says Mr. Ivins:

"The credentials of the agitator; of the man without practical experience, either in business or in government; the credentials of fanaticism; of disregard of all our great national traditions, and of the great determining factors of our national history. His letter of acceptance is not the letter of the statesman, but the letter of the agitator. In every line it is apparent that the man is misled by lack of experience, of training, of accurate information, of well-founded convictions."

The letter of acceptance, says Mr. Ivins, is not the letter of a man of character and of honesty, though Mr. Bryan's friends say he has both those virtues. "The man who wrote that letter is politically insincere and intellectually dishonest, though his life may be clean and all his bills may be paid." If Mr. Bryan had written no letter of acceptance the campaign he has made would convict him of political insincerity and intellectual dishonesty. He has shown that he has no principles. He has discussed a question until he discovered the people were sick of it. Then he has dropped it to take up another, to be discarded in its turn. He has abandoned free silver. He has talked himself out about "imperialism." At present he is trying to make capital out of the question of "trusts." How long it will be before he drops that no one can tell. Probably Chairman Jones of the Democratic National committee, who is under fire in Texas for his connection with a "private monopoly," has already informed Mr. Bryan that the "trust" question is a "two-edged sword."

Mr. Ivins contrasts the character of the two candidates. He says:

"Mr. McKinley is precisely the last man in the world who has the imperial quality. Mr. Bryan is far and away more the sort of stuff out of which dictators are made. Mr. McKinley is a listener; Mr. Bryan is a talker. Mr.

McKinley is interested in the opinions of others; Mr. Bryan in his own alone. For Mr. Bryan the dictates of history and the decrees of science are as nothing compared with his own judgment and the dictates of his own will."

The imperial strain in Mr. Bryan is illustrated in his dictation of a platform to the National Democratic convention. Mr. Cleveland was something of a dictator in his time, but the national convention of 1892 refused to adopt the tariff plank he wished it to. A large majority of the delegates to this year's convention were opposed to the free silver plank which is in the platform, but Mr. Bryan jammed it down their throats. A man who is thus imperious in dealing with his party before election will be even more imperious if elected, not merely in party affairs but in all governmental affairs.

At Nebraska
"MY FRIENDS, I City on Septem-
WANT." ber 26th, 1900, W.

J. Bryan, candidate of a combine for the presidency—nominated by the free silver democratic incorporation, the republican free silver incorporation and the populist flat money incorporation, all in a "trust"—said:

"I want to remind you that the attorney general who is enforcing this law [the same officer having ignored this law for three years] is not trying to destroy a factory; he is trying to prevent a trust from absorbing that factory."

But the same peerless prophet of evil and disaster said in the same speech:

"I learned the other day that there was a reason why I should hold a meeting here. I learned that the action of the attorney general in beginning suit against the starch trust had aroused the people of this community."

How could the action begin against the starch trust? Did not Colonel Bryan just declare he was here, then and there, and a-talking "to prevent a trust from absorbing that factory"—i. e. the Argo factory at Nebraska City.

Smyth's action then, with Bryan's concurrence and inspiration, was against Nebraska City's starch factory, its wage-earners, its owners, its capital and its existence. And Bryan boasted himself the ally, assistant, associate counsel of Smyth in this wicked raid upon the best and largest starch manufacturing plant west of the Mississippi river.

Every vote for Bryan—for the state ticket of Bryanarchy, headed by Poynter, and for its local, legislative ticket is a vote to put down starch making in Nebraska City; to kick capital out of Nebraska when it attempts to come in, and to throttle and destroy all incorporated money everywhere within Nebraska when it antagonizes Bryanarchy.