

JONES PROTESTS. Chairman Jones is very much hurt because of the suggestion made by Secretary Gage that Bryan, if elected president, could have his secretary of the treasury pay out silver where "coin" was stipulated in the contract. He thus indignantly resents the question raised by Mr. Gage:

"It has been the fashion of the republicans for some years to denounce democrats as anarchists, revolutionists, etc., but all fair-minded men will admit that at this time the republican party seems to have a monopoly of revolutionary suggestions. We see a secretary of the treasury in an effort to disturb the business of the country for political effect, suggesting that Mr. Bryan, in case of his election, would deliberately evade the law, with a purpose as unstatesmanlike and unpatriotic as his own in making these suggestions. Fortunately, Mr. Bryan has been before the public long enough for every one to know that tricks and false pretenses are not among his weapons, and suggestions of this kind excite contempt."

During the last session of the fifty-third congress, in 1895, Mr. Bryan, in speaking for his amendment to the gold bond bill, said:

"I offered an amendment which reaffirmed the Matthews resolution declaring all coin bonds payable in gold or silver, and yet less than twenty (I think only thirteen) republicans voted for my amendment. The great majority of the republicans thus declared that coin bonds are gold bonds in fact. If coin bonds are really gold bonds there is less reason for agitation about the use of the word gold in the bond. *We who believe that greenbacks and treasury notes are redeemable either in gold or silver, at the option of the government—we, who believe in the right of the government to redeem its coin bonds in either gold or silver—we, I say, can object to gold bonds as a violent change in our monetary policy, but those who insist that greenbacks, treasury notes or coin bonds are all payable in gold on demand have far less reason to criticise the president.*" This is found in the Congressional Record, page 287, appendix, 4D, fifty-third congress.

This speech of Mr. Bryan justifies all that Secretary Gage has said. It shows that Mr. Bryan *would*, if elected president, do exactly what Secretary Gage said he *could* do. If Mr. Jones believes this would be an evasion of the law, a trick, or a false pretense, Bryan is pledged to this sort of evasion and trickery.

BRYAN TRUST. In his speech before the Chicago conference on trusts, September 16, 1899, William Jennings Bryan said:

"One trust magnate may be more benevolent than another, but there is no good monopoly in private hands, and I do not believe it is safe for any man or group of men to monopolize any article

of merchandise, or any branch of industry."

It is over a year since Bryan made that speech denouncing each and every monopoly, but he is repeating the same doctrine today.

October 10th, he asked in his speech at Nashville, Michigan:

"Do you know of any good monopoly in private hands? Do you know of any man good enough to stand at the head of any monopoly, and determine the price of that which others are to use?"

Well, there is a certain book known as "The First Battle," which is an article of merchandise, and an absolute monopoly in W. J. Bryan's hands. Quite an expensive one, indeed, to many poor men, who have felt that they must have it. On the reverse side of the title page of that interesting work we read:

Entered according to act of congress, in the year 1896, by William J. Bryan, in the office of librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C. All rights reserved.

On the next page is a warning by the publishers against any "fraudulent imitations."

No honest man will deny Mr. Bryan's right to his book, or his privilege to make what he can out of it. It has always been the policy of this country to respect the rights of authors, and to give them a monopoly, or, as the law puts it, "an exclusive right" to their works.

The wrong is that a man enjoying this special protection, and getting rich by making poor men pay a higher price than he could get under the free printing of this book,—and free trading in it,—should in his selfishness declare that other people shall enjoy no such privilege, but have every vestige of protection taken away from them.

IMPERIALISM THE CONSERVATIVE DEFINED. publishes else-

where an article by Louis R. Ehrich defining imperialism. THE CONSERVATIVE agrees with Mr. Ehrich that the acquisition of the Philippines was not in conformity with our traditions of expansion. But the step has been taken. The acquisition has been made and this with the aid of both candidates for the presidency. The future of these islands must now be determined by congress and not by the executive. We believe Mr. McKinley will give his approval of any equitable arrangement for the Filipinos that congress may decide upon, and at the same time he can be depended upon to preserve the present financial fabric. Hence, as a choice of two evils, THE CONSERVATIVE believes the election of Mr. McKinley will better promote the interests of the American people than the election of Mr. Bryan who is pledged to destroy existing financial legislation.

BRYAN FOUR YEARS AGO AND NOW.

[The impression Bryan made upon the people of New York, while a guest of Mr. Croker and Tammany, is quite faithfully portrayed by the following editorial from the New York Post:]

Bryan has made his visit to New York city, and the demonstration, from the spectacular point of view, was all that he could have wished. Tammany hall did its best to furnish crowds, enthusiasm, and red fire wherever he went, with Croker himself always on hand to see that the program was carried out as planned. The candidate was deeply impressed by this exhibition of the power exercised by the organization and by the generalship of its boss. In opening his last speech at Cooper Union, Bryan said:

"This is my fourth meeting for tonight. It concludes the ratification meetings held under the auspices of Tammany, and I am prepared to say 'Great is Tammany, and Croker is its prophet.'"

It is inevitable that one should contrast the present appearance of Bryan with his visit to the city four years ago. The chief speech of last evening was delivered in the same place where he spoke in 1896. Then he read a long and dull discussion on the financial question in Madison Square Garden, while the audience dwindled away; last evening he spoke for something over an hour without notes, and held the close attention of his hearers. The three shorter speeches afterward had the same characteristics.

As an agitator, Bryan showed himself at the Garden last evening able, adroit and forcible. To the great majority of the audience all that he said was new. The careful reader of the reports of his tour in the west, however, soon discovered that he was only repeating those things which he had found to take best with his hearers. Here were all of those catch phrases, about the republican party suggesting to the farmer that it is a silent partner with the Almighty in giving him good crops, while "the fact is that the republican party, instead of being the silent partner, makes all the noise and the Almighty gives the silent part;" about Solomon's proverb regarding the wise man who foreseeth the evil and hideth himself, while the foolish pass on and are punished, "condensed so that you can remember it," and now rendered, "The wise man gets the idea into his head, the foolish man gets it in the neck;" about the republican president sending a message of condolence on the death of a king, but no word when two republics expire; and a number of other expressions equally sure to evoke "Laughter" or "Applause."

Not Outspoken.

The contrast between the Bryan of