

## TO FACE IT OR DIE!

## MCCLURE DIAGNOSES THE DEMOCRATIC MALADY.

It is Chaos or Death?—Not a single hopeful state North, South, East or West for Democracy—Cleveland ism.

The Times, (Dem.), edited by A. K. McClure, in a long editorial headed "Is it Chaos or Death?" says: "The attitude of the democratic organization before the country today is that of utter chaos, and the only problem for the leaders to solve is whether that once great party can be restored to its respect and usefulness, or whether the sequel to its chaotic condition shall efface it from the history of American politics.

"Today the democratic party has not a single hopeful state north of Mason and Dixon's line; it has not a single hopeful state in the west, and the southern states are all trembling in the throes of threatened revolution.

"The party has been condemned by the people with an emphasis that has never been approached in the history of our political contests, and the overwhelming defeat of 1894 called out no statesmanship in the democratic councils in congress, and intensified the madness of democratic lawmakers instead of chastening and recalling them to the lines of patriotism.

"But for the heroic integrity and patriotism of President Cleveland the credit of the nation would have been dishonored, and business—chaos and general distrust must have prevailed throughout the land.

"No party thus poisoned with dishonesty in its vitals can survive, and if there is to be a democratic party in the future it must be promptly organized on the basis of honest government, honest money, honest taxes, and honest elections. Perfidy or blundering in republican statesmanship will not restore the democracy to public confidence. It may destroy the republican organization, but it will not revive democracy. It must be in a position to command the honest men of every political faith, or it must die, and if it cannot retrieve its honor and its fidelity to the country, the sooner it shall die the better it will be for its followers.

"The time has come when intelligent and considerate men will cast party lines to the winds to sustain the integrity of the national faith and the tranquility of business and trade. The Times will support no man for president in 1896 who is not squarely for honest money, for this is the paramount issue. The tariff question is settled, not only for the present, but for the future.

"National and state credit must be established so clearly and positively that the whole world will accept it, failing in that we must pay our thousands of millions of obligations held abroad, not one-half of which could be paid with all the money of every kind now in existence in the country. That is the issue the democracy must face, and it must face it now. If it fails to do so it must die. With the democratic leaders rests the solution of the problem whether the present overthrow of democracy shall be temporary chaos or death. Which shall it be?"—People's Party Paper.

## Government Ownership.

The government ownership of railways, telegraph and telephone lines, is a question that is making more rapid progress than many people are aware of.

The practicability of the idea of government ownership of the means of distribution of products is being manifested in hundreds of cities in the municipal ownership of water works, gas and electric lighting plants, there being no case of record where municipal ownership of these conveniences having been tried that have proven other than satisfactory.

While we have not in this country got beyond municipal ownership, the question of government ownership is growing rapidly, particularly within the last two years.

It is useless for a few foolish partisan slaves and superficial minded men to pooh pooh this idea, as it is coming, and the intelligence of the American people will in a few years accept it.

Out of seventy-three governments in the world, only nineteen are without government ownership of railways, wholly or in part. Fifty-four governments own wholly or in part the railways within their borders, and so far not a single failure in management has been reported, but on the contrary, many of them are so successfully managed as to be sources of revenue to the governments, and yet the freight and passenger rates are far below the rates maintained by corporations, and far below the rates of American railways.

Out of seventy-four governments, all own their telegraph lines except six, one of which is the United States, the others being Hawaii, Cuba, Bolivia, Cyprus, and Honduras. This government owns telegraph lines in the west connecting its posts and Indian reservations, and were erected for the convenience of the government, and before the country was settled or penetrated by railways. On these lines ten-word messages are sent for ten cents, but the moment they strike a corporation line two and a half cents a word is charged.

If other governments are successfully operating railways and telegraph lines, why not the United States? Down deep in your heart, you who call such "paternalism," can you give an intelligent reason why we should not? No, you know you cannot, but you object—the most of you—because it is the policy of your old party to oppose a question

that has been practically demonstrated in three-fourths of the world.

Think of it! In Germany the fare on government lines is only one-fourth of a cent a mile! The wages of the employees on these lines are 120 per cent higher than they were when the lines were under corporate management, and notwithstanding the cheap fares and higher wages paid the employees the German government derived from the roads last year a revenue of \$25,000,000 as a net profit. Think of that, you who are having "paternalistic" shivers and predicting disastrous results if we should try government ownership of railroads in this country!

Australia gave us a pattern in election laws, and about every state in the union has adopted it in some form, and now why not by this system of government ownership of railways? Only \$5.50 is charged, and only first-class fare, too, for riding 1,000 miles in Australia, while laboring men can ride for one-third of a cent a mile. In Victoria the net income from the railroads last year was sufficient to pay the federal taxes. In that country the wages of railroad men are from 25 to 30 per cent more for eight hours' work than are paid in this country for ten or more hours' work.

In Hungary, where the roads are owned by the state or provinces, the fare is one-sixth of a cent a mile, and since the roads have passed into the hands of the government the wages of railway employees have been doubled.

In Belgium fares and freight rates have been cut down one-half and the wages of employees doubled.

In all these countries the efficiency of the service has been greatly increased, the road beds, bridges, and rolling stock kept in better repair, and the trains are run with greater safety and with a less number of accidents than when the roads were operated by corporations.

These statements are based on reports of governments where railroads and their operators form a part of the government business, and hence it cannot be charged that they emanate from men of visionary or impracticable ideas.

In support of government ownership of railroads, we bring as a further proof of its feasibility and practical utility the fact that where we have government control—that is, where roads are placed in the hands of receivers and are operated under the instructions of the United States courts, the management of such roads are characterized with greater economy and efficiency than roads are ordinarily under corporate control. For several years past more than one-third of the mileage of railways in this country has been in the hands of receivers and practically under government management, as not a wheel is turned or a dollar expended that is not under the supervision of the United States courts.

No man can demand an exchange of one kind of money for another, for their idea of parity is unlike that of our thimble-rigging American financiers, who might wisely study the money question in its social and economic aspects, instead of by ways that are dark and tricks that are vain making its acquisition the sole object of their lives.

The recent history of our own country in the civil war, where the mightiest creative and destructive energies ever recorded were developed by a creation of a great instrument—money—in sufficient quantities to promote all the activities of a great people without gold and without silver, all appear to be forgotten.

In returning to specie payments, what kind of strange delusion was extended over the brains of such a people as to tolerate for a single year after its discovery in 1875-'6 the nature of the fraud of 1873?

With the knowledge of the mighty power of sovereignty exercised to maintain the union of the state, why should they doubt as to the power of that sovereignty to save and preserve as equally great as to subjugate and destroy?

Are the arts of peace of any less importance than the arts of war? Are the powers of our government greater for the conduct of war than for the conservation of the peace and prosperity of the people? Is political independence of foreign power more important than financial independence?

Our claim is that the United States can alone act, with greater credit, with greater success, than with concurrent action of other nations, and we have abundant evidence to justify this faith. The remarkable admissions of the Statist (London) recently, and those of the Financial News (London) a year ago, and such able men as Mr. Henry Hucks Gibbs and Mr. Morton Frewen, all go to sustain us in this view. But the fraud of history prove it.

Why, were we to adopt the money of "ideal excellence," as Mr. W. P. St. John calls properly made national paper money, and properly guard its issue and discard gold, the republic would soon outstrip the world in its onward march, and international exchanges could be settled by our products enhanced in value and created in a volume sufficient to do it with our unused gold. But the absurdity of being upon a specie basis with one-half of the specie dishonored necessitates a revision of the idea possessed by too many, that governments are ordained for the benefit of fund-holders exclusively.

We need a recurrence to the fundamental principle "that government is, or ought to be, instituted for the common benefit, protection and security of the people," as enunciated by the fathers of the republic. If it becomes a contest between the powerful few and the mass of the American people as to which shall control the destinies of this republic, who can doubt the final result when American manhood asserts itself?—J. W. Porter, in *The American*.

The rise in the price of oil has added many millions of dollars to the wealth of the Standard Oil Company. Did it earn this wealth? If not it must have stolen it.

Down with all kinds of monopoly.

## FINANCIAL REFORM.

## ARE ARTS OF PEACE LESS IMPORTANT THAN WAR.

All Arguments Advanced on Behalf of the Gold Standard Are Built On Prophecy—Senator Jones on the Stand.

Senator John P. Jones, in summing up his grand plea for bimetallism at the Brussels conference, said:

"All the arguments advanced on behalf of the gold standard are built on prophecy, those on behalf of the double standard on achievement.

"The advocates of the gold standard rely on what they suppose may happen.

"Those of the double standard rely on the facts of history."

The facts and achievements he had amply elucidated in that great address which the Belgian delegate so praised by saying immediately after its close: "Gentlemen, after the remarkable speech which you have just heard little remains to be said. \* \* \* It is not only a monetary treatise, it is a study of social economy."

Senator Jones' words may well be heeded by many very earnest, very honest friends of bimetallism, who halt and doubt and block the way to successful American action by their fears that we cannot succeed independently.

Some of them actually advocated the destructive policy of trying to force concurrent action upon foreign nations by creating sheer distress and making it so universal as to compel action. To such the idea of our being even temporarily placed upon a silver basis was to relegate our country to the social, economic, and moral level of Mexico and China, as though the prosperity of a great people depends upon the color of the money they use. But they ignore the facts of history and of current events. Mexico to-day affords the most promising field for the investment of money among all nations, according to reports, and upon a pure silver basis.

France pursues serenely her course unaffected by panics, weighted down as she is by the greatest national debt and by her vast naval and military armament, and aile to assist her powerful neighbor across the way by a loan of gold to help avert a monetary panic imminent when the Barings failed. The panic-breeding system adopted by the United Kingdom has time and again exposed its weakness, while the strength of the French system is manifested for it provides money instead of wind upon which the industry and commerce of that great people securely rests. France honors all her money and provides a sufficiency, and her funded debt is so wisely distributed as to become a basis of emergency credit among the common people.

No man can demand an exchange of one kind of money for another, for their idea of parity is unlike that of our thimble-rigging American financiers, who might wisely study the money question in its social and economic aspects, instead of by ways that are dark and tricks that are vain making its acquisition the sole object of their lives.

The recent history of our own country in the civil war, where the mightiest creative and destructive energies ever recorded were developed by a creation of a great instrument—money—in sufficient quantities to promote all the activities of a great people without gold and without silver, all appear to be forgotten.

In returning to specie payments, what kind of strange delusion was extended over the brains of such a people as to tolerate for a single year after its discovery in 1875-'6 the nature of the fraud of 1873?

No wonder millionaireism is increasing upon the one hand and pauperism upon the other.—Free Trader.

## It Is Disgusting.

It is disgusting to hear men who seem possessed of ordinary sense and judgment make the assertion—so often heard—"Men can get work who want to work," or "No man need to be idle." Men who make such assertions are either woefully ignorant or find it necessary to advance such argument as an excuse for candidates forced upon the country by their party. Suppose a man starts out to find employment, how many farmers could he find who could give him employment—except during harvest, or at most for a few days or weeks? Take the country over, and we venture the assertion that nineteen out of every twenty would not be able to employ a hand the year around, while eight-tenths could not employ help six months of the year—many not three months, and one-half of all of them could not employ any wage help at all. Then strike the trades and manufacturing industries, and the idle man would fare no better. And yet we hear the silly twaddle, "Men can get work if they want it." Young men who would, under proper conditions, be working for themselves on farms of their own are staying at home helping father and mother make a living, and in many cases the combined efforts of the parents, several grown sons and daughters are necessary for the existence of the whole family. This ought not to be so, and would not if there was an equitable distribution of the fruits of toil, if every man and woman who are willing to labor were receiving a just recompence of reward for their toil. There are causes for these anomalous conditions, and it is the duty of every man and woman to study them and properly apply the remedy. We have been legislated into this condition, and the remedy is an intelligent use of the ballot.

The Farmer's Object Lesson.

A good, honest farmer was standing in front of the court house, yesterday, looking mournfully at his tax receipt. He said: "I brought a bale of cotton here five years ago, sold it for \$49.50. With this money I paid my taxes, \$22; got a dress for my wife, \$5; shoes for the children, \$6; a barrel of flour, \$6.50; fifty pounds of sugar, \$4; ten pounds of coffee, \$2, and went home happy with \$3.75 in my pocket for the preacher. I brought in a bale today, sold it for \$22.50; paid my taxes, \$22.25, and have a quarter left. Tell me I can get four and frock and sugar and shoes for half I paid then, but it pears to me I haint got the half. I've about made up my mind to invest this quarter in United States bonds and howl for the gold standard."

The rise in the price of oil has added many millions of dollars to the wealth of the Standard Oil Company. Did it earn this wealth? If not it must have stolen it.

Down with all kinds of monopoly.

## A GOVERNMENT LOAN.

## BUSINESS WHEN LOANED TO A BANKER.

Paternalism When Loaned to a Farmer—Reasons Why the People's Party Is Becoming the Greatest Factor in National Politics.

The national banking law is class legislation. Those having \$50,000 can invest in that amount of non-taxable, interest-bearing government bonds. Then they can organize a banking corporation, and upon depositing these bonds with the government as security, Uncle Sam will indorse \$45,000 of the corporation's notes, printing and supplying them at a tax of one per cent. These notes the corporation can use the same as money in their banking business, loan them out to the people at usurious rates of interest, etc. The bonds keep right on drawing interest, however, and are non-taxable—a good investment in themselves. This privilege of depositing money (bonds) with Uncle Sam, then draw out 90 per cent, and still draw interest upon the whole of the original deposit, is one which is not granted to the poorer classes of our people. It would, indeed, be a grand thing for our farmers if they could sell their crops, invest their receipts in bonds, draw interest upon the bonds, and the government indorse their notes to the amount of 90 per cent of their investment in bonds, these notes to pass current as money in liquidating debts and buying machinery, provisions, clothing, etc. National bankers go into spasms whenever the subject of government loans to the people is broached, but what in the world would they go into if it was seriously agitated that the farmers should have the same privilege of investing their one hundred or five hundred dollars in government bonds as Shylock has investing his \$50,000? And why shouldn't a farmer's note of \$10, indorsed by Uncle Sam, be just as good as the national banker's \$10 note, being secured by interest-bearing, non-taxable bonds deposited with Uncle Sam? There would certainly be no difference in the value of the two; one would have just as much "basis" and "backing" as the other. The only reason why we can't buy a \$10 government bond and deposit it at Washington, and have Uncle Sam indorse our note for \$9, is because this is not a government of, by and for the people, but of, by and for the few; because we have class legislation whereby the rich are made richer and the poor made poorer, by being taxed and robbed to make the rich richer. Let a poor man go to Washington and importune Uncle Sam to give him the privilege (in proportion to his means) as the rich man has, and the associated press wires would fairly laugh as the message sped over them to the four quarters of the earth that a fool "crank" called at the treasury department and wanted to buy a \$10 bond, stating that he wished to deposit it with Uncle Sam to indorse a \$9 note for him, so he could pay off \$9 of his indebtedness and still have \$10 left, safely invested in an interest-bearing, non-taxable bond! He would be a "crank," indeed—about as "cranky" as any "crank" ever gets to be—except a privilege from the present monopoly government, which is only intended for the favored few and not for the many; which is only intended for the non-producing shyster and not for the producing masses.

No wonder millionaireism is increasing upon the one hand and pauperism upon the other.—Free Trader.

## It Is Disgusting.

It is disgusting to hear men who seem possessed of ordinary sense and judgment make the assertion—so often heard—"Men can get work who want to work," or "No man need to be idle." Men who make such assertions are either woefully ignorant or find it necessary to advance such argument as an excuse for candidates forced upon the country by their party. Suppose a man starts out to find employment, how many farmers could he find who could give him employment—except during harvest, or at most for a few days or weeks?

Take the trades and manufacturing industries, and the idle man would fare no better. And yet we hear the silly twaddle, "Men can get work if they want it." Young men who would, under proper conditions, be working for themselves on farms of their own are staying at home helping father and mother make a living, and in many cases the combined efforts of the parents, several grown sons and daughters are necessary for the existence of the whole family. This ought not to be so, and would not if there was an equitable distribution of the fruits of toil, if every man and woman who are willing to labor were receiving a just recompence of reward for their toil. There are causes for these anomalous conditions, and it is the duty of every man and woman to study them and properly apply the remedy. We have been legislated into this condition, and the remedy is an intelligent use of the ballot.

There is no tragedy like that of poverty. No pain can grind the human heart like that which comes to the husband and wife when they face the cold fact that he is out of work, and then look at the tender faces of the little ones, so confident that the father can take care of them. Yet we know that in thousands of homes in the happy land of America this tragedy is being enacted. If we knew that some fiend was passing from house to house killing women, and dashing children's brains out, how long would the good people permit it to continue? Yet poverty is worse. The slow, dull agony at heart, the faint flicker of expectation when returning feet are heard, the death weight on the heart when she reads on his face "no work?" This is pain which no rich and happy woman can understand. One must feel it—one must know how cruelly precious a dollar can seem—to understand what real suffering is. One must realize what it is to be cold and hungry in a city full of happy, careless people who waste their precious money, who revel in and grow tired of the light and warmth and food, for want of which little children are dying, in order to know the meaning of a real heartache.—Rockville Tribune.

## Diplomacy Versus Duck.

There was a doctor who claimed that he was not much on smallpox, but was great on fits. The administration may not be much on diplomacy, but nothing can beat it in duck hunting. Its deeds in this line are still being sung by the cuckoo.

The alien owners of land in the United States were freed from paying the income tax by the decision of the Supreme court. The men who are drawing salaries that are paid by the people of this country are taking mighty good care of foreigners.

There is no such thing as a

## A Just Rebuke.

Miss Kate Field in her Washington speaks of the populists as the "disgruntled tailings" of both political parties. We are very sure Miss Field has had history, and that she has noted the fact that, springing in protest out of the present which has been nourished by the past, has come every reform and all reformers. Using her symbolism we could mock every noble effort of humanity to make better its conditions. We could even sneer at the great Galilean who was pre-eminently disgruntled with the two old sects, those scribes and pharisees. The cultured editor of the Washington can not be excused for her contemptuous treatment of the reformers of today. Her vision is too broad, her historic sense is too keen, to charge her with ignorantly reviling the two million men who demand a more complete ascendancy of ethics in our civilization.

Her offense consists in yielding to the rule of the popular of this culminating age. She is foolishly weak in this particular, and by so yielding she weaves the shroud of oblivion for herself and her paper. Just so did those Boston editors who revised William Lloyd Garrison's cause triumphed.

Secretary Carlisle says:

"That the amount of money in the country is greater than is required for the transaction of business is conclusively shown by the fact that it has accumulated and is still accumulating in the financial centers to such an extent as to constitute a serious embarrassment to the banks in which it is deposited, many of which are holding large sums at a loss. This excessive accumulation of currency at particular points is caused by the fact that there is no such demand for it elsewhere as will enable