

BRYAN IN CHICAGO.

Talks Against Gold Standard, Trusts and Imperialism.

Urge Chicago Democrats to Stop Factional Strife and Unite Radicals Kept from Bolting.

At the meeting of the national democratic committee at the Auditorium, Chicago, Thursday the 29th, William J. Bryan succeeded in restoring peace between the warring factions in the local democracy, and in response to a tumultuous demand addressed the meeting as follows:

"Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen: I am going to speak a few unmeaning words. [Cries of 'Loudier' and laughter.] You have already listened for as long a time as you are accustomed to attend a meeting, and it would not be proper for me to enter at any great length upon any of the questions which are now before the public. I am somewhat embarrassed in speaking in Chicago, because the advocates of the Chicago platform are divided into two kinds, and it is not my business to employ the secret service to ascertain what democrats are firmest believers in the party's platform. [Applause.] Look about to see what party is not to drive out of the democratic party any professed believers in the Chicago platform, but to so impress upon all democrats the importance of the principles at stake that all local differences will be forgotten in the determination to carry this government back to the foundations laid by the fathers.

"When Lincoln was appealing to the people of the country in 1861 he gave utterance to a sentiment that must be the sentiment of every one who realizes the magnitude of the struggle in which we are engaged. After paying a tribute to the founders of the country, he said, in the declaration of independence:

"I charge you to drop every party and insignificant thought for any man's success; it is nothing; I am nothing; Judge Douglas is nothing; but do not destroy that immortal emblem of humanity, the declaration of American independence."

"So in this country to-day we find some discussing persons, some discussing whether this man or that man or some other man is the best representative of democratic doctrine. I appeal to you as Lincoln did, to drop every party thought about the man and not only of the principles enunciated by the founders in 1861, principles that carry us back to the landmarks of the constitution. We are interested first in writing a platform, and we want a platform that fits the democratic party, a platform written like the last platform, not by party bosses, but by the voters of the democratic party. When we get a platform that fits the democratic party it will be easy enough to find in state and nation candidates who fit the platform, but it is the principle above the man, and no man is fit to be a leader when he wanted to lead who is not fit to be a follower when some one else is wanted to lead."

"In the brief time that I shall occupy your attention I desire to crowd into a few propositions an argument on three subjects. I need not tell you that the democratic platform of 1861 will be reaffirmed as the first plank of the democracy of 1896. Occasionally some one talks about getting off of that platform, but upon investigation it is generally found that the man who wants to get off of it was never sent upon the platform. The people who made the platform by writing the right said the democratic party in 1861 are still firm in the faith, and there is only one plank in that platform of which I shall speak to-night, and that is the one plank toward which most of the criticism is directed.

"I would defend every plank assailed.

"But there are some who say that if we will just drop the money question that we will make it easy for those who left us to come back. The fight in 1861 was won on the money question. In the money question expressed in a speech recently that afforded us the means of distinguishing the believer in bimetallism from the believer in the gold standard. And if they tell you to-day that events have vindicated the gold standard you can answer them first, that when Mr. McKinley sent a commission all the way to Europe to get rid of the gold standard he admitted that we were right in 1861 when he said the gold standard was not satisfactory. Some of you may be so prejudiced that you cannot do justice to Mr. McKinley, but I am so inclined that I can win credit for sincerity when he appointed men of distinguished men and sent them all the way to Europe to cry out in every market place: 'Help, help the American people out of the hole that the gold standard put them into.' Not only can you point to the fact that the commission went to Europe as evidence that the gold standard was not then satisfactory, but you can point to the failure of the commission to secure international aid as evidence that independent action is absolutely necessary to secure success. If they tell you that the discovery of gold in the Klondike and the immediate increase in the value of gold has given us more money and made better times, you can reply to them that when they say that they confess the truth of the quantitative theory of money, and you can add that if a little gold from the Klondike or a little gold from Europe is able to make a little better times, that if we would open the mints to the coining of silver as well as gold and take the money out of our own mountains and have our own money now and at all times, we could have great deal better times and not depend on English gold or gold from the Klondike or from our own country. You can remind them that when we were discussing the silver question, and our ability to maintain the parity, they said that the silver standard was the best standard. Production of silver we could not keep the metals together. If that argument had weight when they made it, we can now say that an increasing production of gold makes it easier to keep the metals together than it used to be when they found fault with us. But this is an old question, and one about which we have talked many times."

"There is another question, half new and half old. The trust question that was in the campaign of 1861 enough to get all the trusts onto the other side, and yet not enough to make the people understand what the trust question was. And even now you will find people who say that the republican party is doing all that it can do. Why, the trust is so bad and so indefensible that even in Ohio, in a state convention controlled by Mr. Hanna, they had to adopt a resolution demanding trusts to be bad, and when that convention condemned the trusts, who in all the world will dare demand the trusts? [Great applause.] The trust is bad because of the monopoly feature. When a few control a product necessary to human existence, then those few control to a large extent the lives and the happiness of all who produce these articles, all who work in producing, and all who furnish the raw material used in its manufacture. And can we afford to build up in this nation a system by which a few shall transmit wealth from generation to generation, where the masses can only hope for a clerkship under some trust? And if they say that there is no way to stop the trust, that the republicans are doing all they can, remember that it is within the power of the president to appoint an attorney general who will enforce the law against trusts, even if he has to go to the republican party to get the attorney general. And if the law upon the statute books is insufficient, it is within the power of the attorney general to propose laws which are sufficient, and if the constitution stands in the way, it is within the power of the

attorney general to recommend an amendment to the constitution which will give to congress plenary power to deal with this subject. But the republican party is powerless to annihilate the trusts so long as the trusts furnish the money to keep the republican party in power—[applause]—so that the administration has it in its power to extinguish the trusts, if it so desires.

"When we came to the Philippines question again they say: 'What can the administration do?' There was a time between the signing of the treaty and the breaking out of hostilities—two months lacking six days—and when we asked them what they were going to do, they said they hadn't had time to decide what to do. Why, there are but two sources of government, force and consent. Monarchies are founded upon force, republics upon consent. Our declaration of independence declare that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Is that doctrine true or is it false? If it is false, how long ought it to take to decide what to do in the Philippines? We never said a word of truth of that declaration when we went to war with Spain. We said the people of Cuba are and of right ought to be free. Why? Because they live near us? No. Because they are part Spanish? No. They were and of right ought to be free because they wanted to be free, and governments come up from the people. [Applause.] If they were and of right ought to be free, who can draw a line between them and the people of the Philippines? Where is the difference that entitles one to liberty and another to slavery? You say you don't know what to do? [Applause.] If you find a pocketbook, and on it the name of the owner, do you have to count the money in the pocketbook before you know what to do with the pocketbook?

"If the doctrine set forth in the declaration of independence is sound, then we cannot rightfully acquire title by conquest. If the doctrine set forth in the declaration of independence is sound, we cannot rightfully purchase \$6,000,000 of people at \$2 apiece from an alien monarch, whose rebellious subjects we ourselves armed to fight against their monarch. There is a principle involved, and when the principle is once understood its application is not difficult and if the people of the Philippines islands are and of right ought to be free, then this nation should withdraw at once.

"I charge you to drop every party and insignificant thought for any man's success; it is nothing; I am nothing; Judge Douglas is nothing; but do not destroy that immortal emblem of humanity, the declaration of American independence."

"So in this country to-day we find some discussing persons, some discussing whether this man or that man or some other man is the best representative of democratic doctrine. I appeal to you as Lincoln did, to drop every party thought about the man and not only of the principles enunciated by the founders in 1861, principles that carry us back to the landmarks of the constitution. We are interested first in writing a platform, and we want a platform that fits the democratic party, a platform written like the last platform, not by party bosses, but by the voters of the democratic party. When we get a platform that fits the democratic party it will be easy enough to find in state and nation candidates who fit the platform, but it is the principle above the man, and no man is fit to be a leader when he wanted to lead who is not fit to be a follower when some one else is wanted to lead."

"In the brief time that I shall occupy your attention I desire to crowd into a few propositions an argument on three subjects. I need not tell you that the democratic platform of 1861 will be reaffirmed as the first plank of the democracy of 1896. Occasionally some one talks about getting off of that platform, but upon investigation it is generally found that the man who wants to get off of it was never sent upon the platform. The people who made the platform by writing the right said the democratic party in 1861 are still firm in the faith, and there is only one plank in that platform of which I shall speak to-night, and that is the one plank toward which most of the criticism is directed.

"I would defend every plank assailed.

"But there are some who say that if we will just drop the money question that we will make it easy for those who left us to come back. The fight in 1861 was won on the money question. In the money question expressed in a speech recently that afforded us the means of distinguishing the believer in bimetallism from the believer in the gold standard. And if they tell you to-day that events have vindicated the gold standard you can answer them first, that when Mr. McKinley sent a commission all the way to Europe to get rid of the gold standard he admitted that we were right in 1861 when he said the gold standard was not satisfactory. Some of you may be so prejudiced that you cannot do justice to Mr. McKinley, but I am so inclined that I can win credit for sincerity when he appointed men of distinguished men and sent them all the way to Europe to cry out in every market place: 'Help, help the American people out of the hole that the gold standard put them into.'

"Not only can you point to the fact that the commission went to Europe as

an evidence that the gold standard was not then satisfactory, but you can point to the failure of the commission to secure international aid as evidence that independent action is absolutely necessary to secure success.

"If they tell you that the discovery of gold in the Klondike and the immediate increase in the value of gold has given us more money and made better times, you can reply to them that when they say that they confess the truth of the quantitative theory of money, and you can add that if a little gold from the Klondike or a little gold from Europe is able to make a little better times, that if we would open the mints to the coining of silver as well as gold and take the money out of our own mountains and have our own money now and at all times, we could have great deal better times and not depend on English gold or gold from the Klondike or from our own country. You can remind them that when we were discussing the silver question, and our ability to maintain the parity, they said that the silver standard was the best standard. Production of silver we could not keep the metals together. If that argument had weight when they made it, we can now say that an increasing production of gold makes it easier to keep the metals together than it used to be when they found fault with us. But this is an old question, and one about which we have talked many times."

"There is another question, half new and half old. The trust question that was in the campaign of 1861 enough to get all the trusts onto the other side, and yet not enough to make the people understand what the trust question was. And even now you will find people who say that the republican party is doing all that it can do. Why, the trust is so bad and so indefensible that even in Ohio, in a state convention controlled by Mr. Hanna, they had to adopt a resolution demanding trusts to be bad, and when that convention condemned the trusts, who in all the world will dare demand the trusts? [Great applause.] The trust is bad because of the monopoly feature. When a few control a product necessary to human existence, then those few control to a large extent the lives and the happiness of all who produce these articles, all who work in producing, and all who furnish the raw material used in its manufacture. And can we afford to build up in this nation a system by which a few shall transmit wealth from generation to generation, where the masses can only hope for a clerkship under some trust? And if they say that there is no way to stop the trust, that the republicans are doing all they can, remember that it is within the power of the president to appoint an attorney general who will enforce the law against trusts, even if he has to go to the republican party to get the attorney general. And if the law upon the statute books is insufficient, it is within the power of the attorney general to propose laws which are sufficient, and if the constitution stands in the way, it is within the power of the

The Currency Question.

PLACING THE BLAME.

The Trust Is the Natural Offspring of the Accursed Gold Standard.

The more we see of the trusts the less of bitterness do we feel toward these institutions. We believe in laying the blame where it rightfully belongs. The trust condition is the natural offspring of the accursed and altogether abominable gold standard. It is not right, therefore, to visit the sins of the wicked father upon the legitimate progeny. We would crush the head of the golden viper as we would that of any other venomous serpent, and we would foster the germ of good that undoubtedly exists in the trusts for the benefit of all the people. The gold standard is so silly, so suicidal, so abominably unjust and wretched and irretrievably wicked that we cannot think of it with any degree of patience. It is the abomination of desolation, the pestilence that walketh in the night, the slayer of innocent women and children, the wickedness that is wholly wicked and altogether vile. But there is some good in the trusts. The children are better than the father, and such good as there is in them we would preserve and foster for all the people.

We would establish by law a certain date in the future, when and whereon every trust then in existence or to be thereafter organized, together with all its franchises and assets, should become public property and be operated by the government for the good of the people. Nor would we make the date very far in the future. The people now on earth who have suffered from the operation of the trusts ought to have some of the benefits. Yet we would not be so ungracious as to confiscate trust property without giving them a chance to reform. The people are not wholly blameless in this trust matter. They have stood by and permitted scoundrels and thieves in high places to debase the coin of the realm, which debasement has led to the formation of the trusts. We, the people, have committed the sin of omission in refusing to administer legal punishment to the traitors who debased the coin and established the single standard. And now if we suffer a little for our own sin we must not complain. Atonement comes through sacrifice. Let us therefore give the trusts time—a little time—to prepare for the day of settlement, then if they fail to heed the warning let them do the rest of the suffering. Moreover, the constitution forbids the enactment of ex post facto laws. We cannot create a crime out of something that was not previously criminal; but we can fix a date and say to all trusts, thus far and no farther shalt thou go. This is the thing to do with the trusts.

But in order that no more trusts may be bred, let us garrote the gold standard and forever put an end to the national banks.—Mississippi Valley Democrat.

COMMON GROUND.

Propositions Upon Which All Anti-Monopolists Can Unite—Abolish the Gold Standard.

While it is always difficult to secure harmonious cooperation between distant and separate political organizations, there are times when this cooperation is both wise and necessary. In the campaign of 1861 the democrats, populists and silver republicans united in demanding the immediate restoration of independent bimetallism at the existing ratio of sixteen to one, and they agreed in declaring that the money question was of paramount importance at that time. The question now arises: Should these three political organizations act together in the congressional campaign? I answer without hesitation: Yes. Those who answer No must assume the burden of proving, first, that cooperation was unnecessary in 1861, or second, that conditions have so changed as to make unwise now what was wise then. The defeat that befell the allied forces does not prove cooperation at that time to have been unwise, unless it can be shown that some one party would have been more successful than if we combined. Cooperation does not contemplate abandonment of party organization, or the surrender of any political principles, nor is cooperation defended on the ground that the platforms of three parties are identical. Campaigns generally turn upon a few issues, sometimes upon one, and events do much to determine which issue shall most absorb public attention. If the democrats, populists and silver republicans were agreed upon but one question, that might be important enough to justify cooperation, although the parties differed on all other subjects; but those who advocate the union of the principal reform forces against the common enemy can point not to one, but to a number of reforms which are demanded with equal emphasis by democrats, populists and silver republicans.

First—They are unalterably opposed to gold monometallism.

Second—They demand the immediate restoration of bimetallism at the present ratio by the independent action of this country.

Third—They oppose the retirement of the greenbacks.

Fourth—They oppose the issue of paper money by national banks.

Fifth—They oppose the issue of interest-bearing bonds in time of peace.

Sixth—They favor the abolition of trusts.—Nashville (Tenn.) Democracy.

GOLD STANDARD BLESSINGS.

How the Trusts Benefit the People—An Actual Sample of the Process.

As a sample of how the gold standard trusts are a good thing for the people, the following will show: A Clinton blacksmith received a catalogue from a Chicago house the first of the year. He did not have occasion to order goods from that house until last month, when he ordered goods amounting to \$9, sending a draft for that amount with order. The goods came, but there was an additional amount of \$3.15 added to the price on account of the increase in prices, on account of the blessings that come from the workings of the gold standard and other Mark Hanna principles of government. Here was a little over 35 per cent. added to the cost, or over one-third more than the same article would have cost before the trusts on the goods were formed.

Now, does any sane person suppose these goods would be sold to the consumer at the same price they would have had the catalogue price been adhered to? Of course, the blacksmith made his price to his customer just 35 per cent. higher than he would have done before the trust raised the price. So that the reaper, though he be as big a fool as the mose that swam the river to get a drink, can see that the consumer—the last one to buy the articles—has to pay the increase in price caused by the trust.

In this case, the trust raised the price. So that the reaper, though he be as big a fool as the mose that swam the river to get a drink, can see that the consumer—the last one to buy the articles—has to pay the increase in price caused by the trust.

Here is a lesson for the consumer that is so plain that he cannot help seeing the effect of the gold standard trusts, no matter how blind he tries to be. It will fitly apply in every case where the trusts and combines have raised the price. On plows the increase was 15 per cent., making a plow that cost \$20 before the trust was formed \$22. As the farmer is the last one that buys the plow, he pays his \$3 more and never gets it back. Before the farmer buys the plow, each one who sells it adds \$3 for the extra cost, therefore losing nothing. But the farmer, being the consumer, gets the full "blessing" of the gold standard blessing, and yet wonders why it is he makes so little money when he works so hard.—Clinton (Ill.) Register.

INFAMOUS PROPOSITION.

To Make United States Bonds Payable in Gold—Other Debts Included in Scheme.

The meeting of republican members of the senate finance committee in New York recently to consider the currency bill drawn up by the house caucus committee on the currency, resulted, it is understood, in the bill being handed over to Senator Aldrich to be further considered with other senators. He is to go through the bill carefully, confer with some of his colleagues, and report later to the other members of the committee. It is gathered that there is now a slight difference of opinion between individual members of the house and the senate committee over the final and formal enactment into law of the principle of the gold standard. It is believed that the outcome will be an explicit declaration in favor of the gold standard. It is said that some members of the joint committee were inclined to avoid making a declaration upon this subject, but strenuous opposition has been made to such a policy. The opponents of evasion pointed out, it is said, that the republican party is recognized as the advocate of the gold standard, and might as well go on record once for all. These men advised in favor of drawing the financial issue right away, and placing the republican party irreversibly and unmistakably upon the side of the gold standard, as the standard of sound money. The advocates of the gold standard, it is said, that conditions have so changed as to make unwise now what was wise then. The defeat that befell the allied forces does not prove cooperation at that time to have been unwise, unless it can be shown that some one party would have been more successful than if we combined. Cooperation does not contemplate abandonment of party organization, or the surrender of any political principles, nor is cooperation defended on the ground that the platforms of three parties are identical. Campaigns generally turn upon a few issues, sometimes upon one, and events do much to determine which issue shall most absorb public attention. If the democrats, populists and silver republicans were agreed upon but one question, that might be important enough to justify cooperation, although the parties differed on all other subjects; but those who advocate the union of the principal reform forces against the common enemy can point not to one, but to a number of reforms which are demanded with equal emphasis by democrats, populists and silver republicans.

First—They are unalterably opposed to gold monometallism.

Second—They demand the immediate

restoration of bimetallism at the present ratio by the independent action of this country.

Third—They oppose the retirement of the greenbacks.

Fourth—They oppose the issue of paper money by national banks.

Fifth—They oppose the issue of interest-bearing bonds in time of peace.

Sixth—They favor the abolition of trusts.—Nashville (Tenn.) Democracy.

Considerations Pro and Con.

She—He wants dot I shall sleep.

Her Father—Vell, I don't know—16

would save der expense of der wedding;

but, on der odder handt, you wouldn't

get noooch wedding presents.—Puck.

DEMOCRACY ALL RIGHT.

The Situation in Georgia Is Typical of That in All Democratic States.

Congressman James M. Griggs, of Georgia, while in Washington was asked to contribute something to the Post's bureau of political information. This Georgia congressman very readily consented to do, and in terms brief and terse, and yet admirably clear, he proceeded to set forth the political situation in Georgia, which, making due allowance for local conditions, is the situation in all the naturally democratic states. Congressman Griggs informed the Post's reporter that Mr. Bryan will have a solid delegation from Georgia at the next national convention; that the distinguished democratic leader is as popular in Georgia in