

AN EFFECTIVE SPEECH.

The evening of September 26, 1900, will never be forgotten by those citizens who welcomed to Nebraska City that night the peerless Colonel Bryan, J. Hamilton Lewis, and Constantine Blarney Smythe (nee Smith), for the patriotic purpose of hearing how to "bust" the National Starch Trust, and how to protect Nebraska City against designing men in general, and certain Mortons in particular. All the eloquent expounders did remarkably well in their endeavors to explain how this people and town would suffer, and finally commercially perish, if the Argo Starch manufactory was permitted to continue doing business in its own way, instead of in their way. But as mere lightning bugs—fireflies in a June night—beside the effulgent glow of the sun at midday, were all the other speeches compared to that of Colonel Bryan. That heroic crusader against the power of incorporated money was more than usually brilliant and reckless in his assaults upon incorporations generally, and particularly so upon all those which were employing men in and building up the prosperity of Nebraska City. Without fear, the great peerless colonel declared that he would proceed to orate "in the shadow of the Starch Works."

He quoted frequently, at length and with evident relish from THE CONSERVATIVE and its editor. He defied and denounced anybody and everybody who favored incorporations like the National Starch Company, doing business at Nebraska City. He flayed with keen-edged sarcasm and razor-bladed irony, the poor, insignificant, small-fry originators of our Argo Factory, and told with prophetic tongue, just precisely how the Mortons and other Nebraska City holders of the stock therein would be soon relegated to the rear, and the factory in Nebraska City shut down, forever, unless he and his coadjutor forecasters and their admonitions were believed and heeded.

It was a resonant speech, and the telegraphing of it into every large commercial centre—Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago and St. Louis—by the especial efforts of Gold Standard democrats, demonstrated to all those cities the utter, shameless and desperate demagoguery of Bryan, in his assaults upon all forms of incorporated capital. It was efficient in arousing the conservative citizenship of the republic to a sense of danger. It made more contributions to the campaign funds of Mark Hanna in the four following days than all the McKinleyites in the United States had been able to raise in the four preceding weeks. It produced vastly more and better effects than any other Bryan speech, and proved beneficial to the country. It did more to ensure his defeat in the country at large, and a thousand times more to temporarily guaran-

tee his political erasure in Nebraska, than all other speeches during the whole campaign.

That speech was against a very important home industry. It was a raid upon the Starch Antagonized Home Factory and its Labor. two-hundred and odd well-paid and well-contented operatives. It was made in malice. It was heralded by Oldham, in Syracuse, Nebraska, as an attack upon the Mortons, by which ten-thousand votes would be lost if the proposed onslaught was abandoned. Oldham's utterance, made in the presence of his peerless leader, was stenographed by a CONSERVATIVE employee.

How have the forecasts of that speech been verified? Have the Starch Works ceased? Are they not now being expanded, enlarged, and fifty thousand dollars expended in their betterment? And is this industry and is the Cold Storage Plant and is the Morton-Gregson Packing House the result of the efforts of Populism, Bryanarchy, and its expounders?

Recall all the prophecies of that remarkable, rampant oratory at Nebraska City, September 26, 1900, and find, if you can, a single statement, which has been proved true by subsequent events! Find one economic utterance that has not been demonstrated a lie!!

THE PRECINCTS OF THE BRITISH CAPITOL.

BY LAWRENCE IRWELL.

The precincts of the British House of Commons differ so materially from those of the national capitol at Washington that a brief account of the general condition of affairs at the former may be of some interest to the readers of THE CONSERVATIVE.

The lobby of the British House of Commons has changed considerably during the past twenty years. At the present time the inner lobby—or members' lobby, as it is sometimes called, in order to distinguish it from the central hall—is reserved for members of the two houses of parliament and ex-members of the house of commons, and in addition, for a certain number of persons who must be called "professional politicians." These latter include the chief organizers and the "wire-pullers" of the political parties; newspaper men, representing the chief London and provincial papers and the press agencies; parliamentary agents (not many of them), who are interested in the promotion of railroad and similar "private" bills; and the secretaries of ministers and ex-ministers, though not those of ordinary members of parliament. The names of these selected few

are placed upon the lobby list, which the sergeant-at-arms controls, and which he can, and does revise from time to time as he may see fit.

Privilege of Sergeant-at-Arms.

But before the scare, or, as some people prefer to call it, the alleged scare, followed the dynamite outrages at Westminster and elsewhere prior to 1800, the entree to the members lobby was by no means a special or exceptional privilege. Even to this day, indeed, when the exclusion of all "strangers" and persons having "no right there" is very strictly enforced by the officials, who certainly do not shrink from their duty in this matter. There are individuals who try to insist that they are at liberty to enter the lobby because they were in the habit of doing so a few years since without any special order from Mr. Speaker or the sergeant-at-arms. Not long ago the ex-editor of a daily newspaper expressed his intention of visiting the house to see some of his old friends. He was assured that to carry out his project satisfactorily he would have to procure an order from a member to see the precincts of the house. A ticket for the speaker's gallery, or for one of the much coveted seats "under the gallery," would carry him through the lobby; but he would not be allowed to stand or walk about there for many minutes. The newspaper man scoffed at the idea of going to all this trouble, and said that a few years before, he was accustomed to come and go as he chose while the house was in session. He refused to believe in lobby lists and lobby privileges. Nobody used to stop him; nobody would be at all likely to stop him now. Nevertheless, this gentleman afterwards admitted that, incredulous as he was, experience had proved to him that he had under the present conditions, no more opportunity of getting into the lobby than in the old days, he had of walking into the house itself, past every watchful official, and taking the speaker's chair prior to a great debate. Anybody who tried to pass by force along the narrow way leading from the central hall to the members' lobby, would find his path barred by at least half a dozen policemen—constables, they are called in England, and he would be seized and eventually taken before a magistrate. Even were he, by much guile and by deep laid plots, to succeed in reaching the lobby, his presence would be quickly noticed and his expulsion would follow in a trice.

Reasons for Care in Exclusion.

The exact reason for this rigid exclusion of strangers from the members lobby may not at first sight seem clear or reasonable, for people are, it may be argued, admitted to the central hall and elsewhere within the precincts of the house. After answering a few questions,