

# Supplement

TO THE DALLAS CHRONICLE. SATURDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1906.

## ISSUES DISCUSSED BY MEN OF ALL PARTIES.

### McClellan's Tribute to the Soldiers of Our Small Army.

### Progress of the Campaign Commented On by Persons of All Shades of Political Thought—Imperialism No Issue.

A missionary was sent to convert Dewey to Democracy at Manila. He represented the most potential politicians in the Democratic party—those who could have given him the nomination if he would have consented to a few-line sentiments and glittering generalities. If Dewey had consented at Manila to be a Democratic candidate he would unquestionably have been the candidate. He would have been an imperialist something like; an imperialist wouldn't have hurt the Democrats a bit. The Democratic party wouldn't have cared a rap about imperialism nor about silver at 10 to 1 or at 83 to 1. They would have gone in on the heroes. They would have celebrated a conqueror as their candidate, and been glad and proud and stuck up and happy to support a man who had shed blood, conquered territory and surrounded the world with his glories. That is what the Democracy wanted.—Murat Halstead.

Whoever attempts under whatever popular cry to shake the stability of the public currency and bring on distress in money matters, stabs your interest and your happiness to the heart.—Daniel Webster, in the Senate Jan. 31, 1834.

"Militarism," "Imperialism," are terms used by newspapers, politicians and platformers to scare the people and catch votes. They are weapons—utterly groundless ones of the most demagogic import—used to stir the people which no well-balanced statesman or newspaper will use. There is no more danger of either condition in this great intelligent seventy million freemen and great aggregation of States fortified by those States' rights recognized by our constitution and sustained by our courts, than there is of England becoming an absolute despotism.—Canton (Mass.) Times, Dec.

All the incidents of the past prove that the army will never have the disposition to jeopardize the free institutions of the country. Our nation would be safe indeed, for all time, did the mass of its citizens place upon its institutions the same intelligent appreciation as that in which they are held by the army, and were honor, integrity and respect for the laws as much the rule among the people as they are in the army, which has given two many proofs of heroism, of integrity, of devotion to the country, to be regarded as a source of danger. On the contrary, he who understands its history must regard it with pride and satisfaction as one of the chief ornaments of the nation, as a school wherein are taught and practiced the virtues of valor, self-denial, obedience and patriotism, and as an institution which has never called the blush of shame to the face of an American.—George B. McClellan, Democrat, and nominee for the presidency in 1864.

There are 6,000 people connected with the glass business in Indiana alone and their votes will make the State go for McKinley. We are only protecting our interests. Our wages have been raised 15 per cent in the past two years, 8 per cent last year and 7 per cent this year, just restoring the cut that was made under the Democratic administration in 1893.—William Peck, Glass Workers' Union.

Bryan's name is a household word in every Philippine hut. They are thoroughly familiar with his anti-expansion views, and in him think they see their "deliverer." His nomination and candidacy alone mean the loss of much property and many lives, for it will infuse new life into the insurgent cause and cause them to break out anew.—R. M. Shearer, Inspector of Customs, Mauban, P. I.

Imperialism is a false cry. Never have I seen a Republican who wants to be a king. I am a military man, but I have never been able to find out what they mean by "militarism." If by "militarism" they mean they are opposed to our young men learning the things that will enable them to uphold the flag, then they are opposed to patriotism. One of my sons, Col. Guy Howard, was killed in the Philippines while fighting for the flag, and another one is fighting over there now. Don't talk to me about talking down our flag and giving the Philippines away. It is an insult.—Gen. Oliver O. Howard.

The Republican party in Wyoming is in excellent shape. The State is quite prosperous. This is particularly true of the wool industry, which has been stimulated by the tariff and the general business revival throughout the country. The wool growers all realize that their future depends largely on the continuation of the prosperity which now prevails and I believe that they, to a man, will support McKinley. Our people are paying little attention to the so-called imperialism, but are content to think seriously of the financial and tariff questions. Wyoming will give a handsome majority for McKinley and Roosevelt.—E. A. Slack, Cheyenne, Wyo.

We all know that there has ever been a party in this government, since its foundations were first laid at Bunker Hill and Yorktown, opposed to our territorial expansion and aggrandizement. With

that party I have nothing in common, and the history of my country shows that its power and its croaking prophecies of evil have been disregarded, defied and spurned by the chivalrous spirit of Anglo-Saxon blood, manifest destiny, American progress or whatever you may choose to call it.—Daniel W. Voorhees of Indiana, a Democrat, at Washington, D. C., Feb. 14, 1859.

While I wish Mr. Bryan no ill fortune, I deem his election as President would be a misfortune to him and to the country under present conditions. If elected he would have such a heterogeneous mass of discordant Democrats, Populists, free silverites, greenbackers, anti-expansionists, mossbacks and dissatisfied denouncers to contend with that no harmonious or settled policy, legislative or administrative, could be established.—Col. Geo. W. Warder, Kansas City, Mo., a Democrat who voted for Bryan in 1896.

Imperialism is no issue at all. There is only one issue in this campaign, and that concerns the business interests—the pocketbook issue. While the people are threatened with another financial panic and business depression their thoughts are not going to be concentrated on any cry of imperialism. It is folly to assert that a little war over in the Philippine Islands is of more importance to the people of the United States than their individual and collective interests at home. There is nothing like imperialism in the policy of any political party in this country, and, therefore, it is an impossible issue.—Dr. George L. Miller of Omaha, a sound money Democrat.

**Our Foreign Trade in Corn.**  
Total exports of corn to all foreign countries were, in 1896, 99,992,835 bushels; in 1899, 174,089,094 bushels. The following shows the value of the exports of beef and hog products in 1896 and in 1899:

	1896.	1899.
Beef .....	\$20,720,258	\$28,645,544
Pork .....	10,639,727	4,017,200
Bacon and hams	62,331,151	46,112,610
Lard .....	42,298,462	35,580,851

To China, Japan, Asiatic Russia, Australia, Hawaii and the Philippine Islands, exports of the following two corn-derived products were in 1890 and 1899 respectively in value:

	1890.	1899.
Provisions .....	\$966,775	\$518,150
Fertilizers .....	736,531	114,988

## "DEAR BOY" LETTERS—No. 6

My Dear Boy:

So your employer, Mr. Skinner, says that "The Philippines ought to have their liberty and the United States soldiers ought to be in better business than making war on an innocent people and strangling the life out of a new republic."

Since Mr. Skinner has put in a nutshell the substance of Mr. Bryan's speech, I shall dispose of Mr. Bryan and the whole anti-imperialist crew in answering Mr. Skinner. I know that you have but little time to read and shall use the fewest words possible, as I shall endeavor to give you a clear, intelligent view of the situation over in our new possessions.

1. Our soldiers are not strangling the life out of a new republic, for the very good reason that there never was a republic in the Philippines. A republic is a government by the people through their chosen representatives. The people of the Philippines never were consulted about the so-called Filipino Republic. Its head was a tricky young Tagalog named Aguinaldo, who proclaimed himself dictator and endeavored to make himself so by force of arms. Republics are not governed by a dictator. The form of government which took the place of a constitution in the so-called republic was a lengthy personal decree of Aguinaldo himself. It was not a republic but a despotism which he sought to establish. The people of the Philippine Islands are made up of many different tribes, Negritos, Tagalogs, Moros, Visayans, and more than fifty others. These tribes are separate in blood, sympathies, and to a large extent in language. In addition to these there are thousands of Spaniards, Germans, Americans, and people of other nations who are resident there, and whose persons and property are to be protected. In addition to all these are large numbers of mestizos, people whose mothers were native Filipinos, but whose fathers were Japanese, Chinese or Spaniards.

2. The United States has never made war upon the Filipinos. We have not even been engaged in war, offensive or

defensive, against the Filipinos as a people. The Filipinos number probably ten millions of people and two millions of men capable of bearing arms. If they were united in war against us, the little army which we have there would scarcely be a circumstance in their way. But the majority of the Filipinos are a quiet, docile people, not disposed to fight and not engaged in the insurrection now practically quelled. Aguinaldo had comparatively few supporters outside of his own tribe, the Tagalogs, who comprise probably one-tenth of the whole mass of Filipinos. He, in his mad effort for absolute rule, attacked the forces of the United States, and we were compelled to quell the insurrection.

3. The United States troops are in the Philippines for the protection of the people from murder, rapine and misuse, and for the preservation of law, order and property rights. For many years there have been robber bands in the mountains who would from time to time light down upon the villages and rob and murder the people. The Spaniards paid no attention to the interior, but protected only the coast. Last spring one of these bands attacked a Filipino village and, in addition to the robbery and killing, carried away thirty Filipino women to the hills. Two companies of United States soldiers pursued them, attacked and dispersed the band, and restored the women to their friends. We are bringing to these islands true liberty, "Liberty protected by law."

4. The possession and control of these islands came to us providentially, unexpectedly and unsought. They are ours by treaty, and a treaty which Mr. Bryan approved. We are responsible to the nations of the earth and to the Judge of all the earth for their care. We accept the responsibility in the fear of God and the love of humanity. I may not live to see it, my boy, but if you live twenty years you will see the most marvelous development in the world's history in the Philippines. Good roads, good schools, the development of agriculture, manufactures and mining, the introduction of American push and energy among the people, railroads, and a hundred other means of transformation. You will see there twenty millions of contented and prosperous people who will rejoice in their liberty and their privileges and be proud of their relations to the greatest of all nations, the United States of America. And then, my boy, every Democrat in America will swear that he always was in favor of that thing and that he was ever an expansionist of the first water. YOUR FATHER.

## SHIP SUBSIDY BILL.

### MEASURE HAS BADLY DISCONTENTED THE DEMOCRATS.

In Attempting to Make Party Capital Out of the Shipping Bill They Show Themselves to Be About Evenly Divided For and Against It.

The Democratic leaders in Congress have been making elaborate preparations to make the shipping bill a campaign issue. They have attempted to terrify the Republicans into the abandonment of the bill at the present session at least. It is not known how much the foreign shipping lobby is willing to contribute to the Democratic campaign fund if the bill's consideration is deferred until the short session. Postponement, say the foreign shipping lobby, means the bill's defeat.

A \$200,000,000 a year business is the stake. If Democratic threats of filibustering are effective enough to induce Republicans to postpone the consideration of the shipping bill, the foreign shipping lobby, their free trade allies and Democratic dupes will each have carried their point.

Democratic success up to this time is the more amazing, as their own organization on this question is disclosed. It would be imagined that they would be united in opposition to the bill, if intending to make a campaign issue of it. Just the reverse is the case. They are about evenly divided for and against it. This is shown by the two minority reports that have been filed by the Democratic members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. The first report filed was signed by Messrs. William Astor Chandler, of New York; John H. Small, of North Carolina; and Joseph E. Ransdell, of Louisiana. Their report advocates government aid and opposes free ships. Their suggested amendments to the bill are not of a character to seriously minimize its effectiveness.

The other four Democratic members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee who signed the other report are Messrs. John F. Fitzgerald, of Massachusetts; Marion DeVries, of California; Thomas Speight, of Mississippi; and Wm. D. Daly, of New Jersey. Their support opposes subsidies and in effect advocates free ships. Their report, said to have been written by an attorney of the foreign steamship lines, is largely an attack upon the only American steamship line engaged in the transatlantic trade.

The odium attaching to the Democrats who are fighting the battle of the foreign shipping lobby in Congress, and who advocate the purchase of ships built abroad, instead of their construction in the United States, presents them in a very sorry figure. They will be infinitely more busy in defending their own attitude on this question than they can be in assailing that of the Republicans and a large contingent of their own party associates. The Democratic leaders had made desperate efforts to prevent a public disclosure of their differences, but the courage of nearly one-half of the minority made further concealment of their condition impossible. The Democratic members of the committee who advocate government aid by independently filing their report in advance of the submission of the other minority report, forced the signers of the latter to lamely limp last into the public eye. Their hopeless division shows how utterly impossible it will be for them to make a successful campaign issue of the shipping question.

If Democrats attack a government-aided shipping, Democrats who have the best of the argument may be quoted in answer, Republican ammunition with which to refute Democratic attacks of this character need not be used—it is furnished by the more honest and courageous of the Democrats themselves.

This is a situation which seems almost providential for the united Republicans. They seem to be assured of the votes of a large contingent—probably one-half—of the Democrats in the House in favor of the ship subsidy bill, if it is brought up for passage now. Such an opportunity has not been presented in a generation, and may never again occur so favorable.

The same situation exists in the Senate. The Democrats there are unable to prepare, much less present, a minority report in opposition to the ship subsidy bill. It is well and publicly known that a number of Democrats will speak and vote for the bill. What the Democratic leaders desire to avoid, at all hazards, is the effect it will have upon their party followers that will surely result from the discussion in the Senate of the ship subsidy bill at this session, to disclose a substantial endorsement of their own party associates in advocacy and voting for that bill.

If Republicans can be coerced, intimidated orajoled into postponing the consideration of the ship subsidy bill at the present session, the Democrats may be able to conceal their own weakness in divided opposition to the ship subsidy bill in the Senate. A little incident has clearly demonstrated this, and shown the desperation of the Democratic leaders.

The Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, in his rage at the filing of the Chandler-Small-Ransdell report, sent for these gentlemen and began to angrily upbraid them as traitors to their party, so the report goes, and he told them that by the ill-timed exhibition of independence and honesty they had sacrificed a splendid issue upon which the Democrats could have attacked the Republicans in the coming campaign. The Democrat Chairman, so it is said, was really almost speechless when he was very emphatically told by Messrs. Chandler, Small and Ransdell that he had no authority to denounce their action; that the Demo-

cratic party had not declared itself on this subject in its last national platform; and that in any event they were decidedly opposed to the dragging of the shipping question into partisan politics. They told him that the shipping question was a business proposition—a commercial question, and of great and pressing national importance; that they so considered it, and that they were quite ready to defend their position at any time.

In these very favorable circumstances, for the Republicans to defer action on the ship subsidy bill until the Democratic National Convention can be whipped into adopting an expression in its next national platform, opposing Government aid for the upbuilding of American shipping, will make it infinitely more difficult than ever for courageous and patriotic Democrats to support the measure. It means to gravely imperil, if not actually defeat, its final passage.

The prestige of Democratic success in compelling the Republicans to defer action at this session on the ship subsidy bill—since postponement will be regarded the country over as a Democratic, free trade, foreign shipping victory—will make it all the easier for them to defeat action at the next session, and all the harder for Republicans to secure favorable action.

The opportunity of a generation is within the grasp of the Republican leaders in Congress if they have the courage to grasp it by passing the shipping bill before adjournment at this session.

### PORTO RICANS PLEASED.

British Consul There About the Only Man Who Wants Free Trade. A private letter received from an American in Porto Rico indicates that talk of the hardships predicted to fall upon the Porto Ricans following the enactment of the tariff and civil government laws for the island is moonshine. In his letter he says:

"The people here, irrespective of caste or condition, hail the passage of the Foraker bill with the greatest delight, and are now beginning to prepare for a revival of business and good times. There seems to have been a very grave misrepresentation of facts made in the United States concerning the wants of the natives and business men of this island in so far as it relates to the tariff. It is a mistaken idea that free trade is wanted here. On the contrary the merchants (99 out of every hundred) want a small tariff in preference, and in fact did not at any time object to the 25 per cent. first talked of. They are bright enough to prefer a small indirect tax to a heavy direct form of taxation, to raise the revenues necessary to conduct the government of the island. About the only ones desiring the benefit of free trade are a few foreigners like Mr. Finley, the British consul at San Juan, who have bought up all the sugar and tobacco in sight at a low figure, and have been holding the same in anticipation of a free entry to the States, thereby enabling them to realize more largely on their investment.

Pearl Button Industry. Pearl button-making was first made possible in the United States by the McKinley tariff of 1892. Of course the industry was nearly destroyed by the free-trade Wilson bill of 1894. After further protection was given the industry by the Dingley tariff of 1897, the eighth biennial report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the State of Iowa says:

"A remarkable development of the business was witnessed in 1898, no less than thirty-six factories being established during the first six months of that year."

Seven towns in Illinois and six in Iowa are centers of button-making. It supports an important fishery, and as the report says:

"Besides the people thus directly connected with the business, many others in more than a score of towns are benefited, including merchants, machinists, boatmen, draymen and transportation companies."

Democratic free trade will kill the pearl button business, throw lots of people out of employment and injure local trade and transportation.

### The Enemy's Country.

The Republicans have captured the Bryan kopfes in Nebraska, the boy orator's own State, and are lining up to great shape for the big tussle next fall. They were successful in many municipal contests, and carried Lincoln, Bryan's home city, by the largest majority in years. Is Nebraska becoming also "the enemy's country?"—Troy (N. Y.) Times.

### Power Trade Failures.

Only 406 trade failures last month, with liabilities of \$7,214,787. Compare that with the April failures in the two Democratic years of 1895 and 1898 thus:

Year.	Number.	Liabilities.
1895 .....	1,980	\$13,985,750
1898 .....	1,650	14,920,714
1900 .....	703	7,214,787

### Where Is that Slump?

We would humbly inquire of the Minneapolis Journal and some other ghost-dancing contemporaries where they find the great anti-Republican slump that was to punish the perpetrators of the Porto Rico bill? The election returns show heavy Republican gains almost everywhere. Sioux Falls (S. D.) Leader.

### Demand for Cornmeal.

The foreign demand for cornmeal is becoming quite a factor, thanks to the efforts of the Department of Agriculture, under this administration.

### Not Convinced.

This year the Democratic orator will be charged with the difficult task of trying to convince the man with the full stomach "that he is hungry."



FARMER BRYAN'S NIGHTMARE.

### WHAT IS A TORNADO?

What is a Tornado? is the question you will hear. Asked by every one you meet at this time of the year. It seems so awful stupid, that I often feel inclined

To cyclone with my intellect the whirlwind of their mind.

Now, a full-grown Tornado, it is very seldom seen.

It leaves its tracks behind it, and you know where it has been.

It comes so very sudden, and as quickly doth depart.

That its coming and its going is impressed upon your heart.

Now, I've told you all about it, there is nothing more to know.

Until early in November, when McKinley's sure to show

A Monsoon and a Typhoon, with a whirlwind on the side,

Galloping through the country, tanning Democratic hide.

—James L. "Bromleykite" Pilling.

### Bryan on Pensions.

Mr. Bryan's utterances about the soldiers of the Civil War are worth repeating. Mr. Bryan, as editor of the Omaha World-Herald, passed this Nov. 18, 1892:

"The next session of Congress will have to wrestle with one deficiency of \$36,000,000. This is on account of pensions. The appropriation for next year must be not less than \$150,000,000. It is therefore easy arithmetic to perceive that the appropriation that Congress must make must aggregate not less than \$186,000,000. This tremendous sum would in itself be enough to run a reasonable government. One would not complain if it were an honest debt, but a large proportion is not a debt because it was never earned by any act of patriotism or heroic service. The government is held up and despoiled of no mean portion of itself. One cannot help being curious to see how many more years it will take to exhaust the generation which feels itself injured by the war. It is safe to say that never did a generation display such remarkable longevity."

Isn't it about time that Mr. Bryan was attacking the Spanish war pensioners?

### HUGO DENKENS PRUCT.

A Wisconsin Farmer and Ex-Justice of the Peace to His Nephew.

Yes, Jonathan, that Indianapolis speech as you say, is very fine and lots of it. Mr. Bryan is a smart man enough, but I kvit him for the sake of his "sixteen to one" humbug, and the demonstration at Indianapolis makes me kvit him more. He says he was right then and the people wrong, and that he is right now and the good people must now apologize by electing him President. The other fellows in the convention at Kansas City have not so much faith, but they have hopes, so they compromise with Mr. Bryan and raise a crop of calamity imperialism mixed with the "sixteen to one" old seed, saying to themselves, "Where one don't grow the other will."

Did you ever try to drive in the barn with your hay-load too big on one side—too much hay on one side and too much wheels on the other? Yes, you did; and you didn't say, "Uncle Hugo, we needn't mind, all we do is to back out on the other side; then we drive in the barn all right."

I will tell you a little true story which reminds me of this loading up at Kansas City with the reformation business and the "paramount imperialism" on the top. GERMAN INDEPENDENCE.

A very nice talking man called on my father one day to enquire for sheep and calves to buy. They soon struck a bargain in which he was to pay twenty dollars for two calves and six sheep. That was before greenbacks. He offered my father a twenty dollar bill, but as he was afraid of "wild cat money" (there was plenty of it in those days) my father said he wanted hard money. After much nice talk from the man my father said: "No, I rather have the sheep and calves." Then the man went on with his fine talk and complimented the Germans, saying pleasant things about the "German independence of character."

So they were about to part on friendly terms when the dealer took an awful kvick fancy to one of our horses. Pretty soon a bargain was struck for one hundred dollars. When the buyer came to pay, however, he pulled out eighty dollars in silver and gold and that same twenty dollar bill. Then there was talk if you couldn't rest, but my father said at last: "No, I rather have the horse." The stranger answered: "Well, I give you my note for the bill," but my father

replied: "No, money not good enough to buy sheep won't buy a horse; perhaps you pay your note with such a bill."

Well, Jonathan, I think of that cattle dealer when I read what Mr. Bryan says of his independence of the German voters in his recent speeches, and especially when his subject is "sixteen to one" and the sturdy independence of the German voters.

### COUSIN GERTRUDE'S YOUNG MAN.

Perhaps you don't remember, Jonathan, when your cousin, my Gertrude, used to have calls from a dandy young man. He sometimes sent her fine roses by his little brother from the village. I got suspicious of that young man, Jonathan, and by and by he stopped all at once coming to see Gertrude. You want to know why, Jonathan? Because one day he was driving by, down the road, and I said very kindly and sociable like to him: "My young friend, I guess you needn't trouble to bring or send any more roses to Gertrude because she says she likes 'em fresher than when you send 'em—she has permission to help herself."

You see, I watch that young man when he goes home late one early morning, and I saw him steal my roses on the way out of the front lot, and in the evening next following he sent 'em to Gertrude. If he only keeps the roses for his partaker friends in the village it wouldn't so much matter; but when he steals them to make himself solid with my little Gertrude, he reminds me of Bryan quoting from Abe Lincoln's speeches to try to make the people think how much his party loves the people—when all the time before, the Democrats had no use for Mr. Lincoln. Lincoln was a great Republican, whom to love is fashionable, even with Democrats now. But when their great man, Mr. Bryan, offers Republican voters roses out of Lincoln's garden they naturally feel like Gertrude—they like 'em fresher, and they have permission to help themselves.

### WILLIAM E. ANDERSON.

Gold Supply Nearly Doubled. Mr. Bryan said in 1893, "We want the free coinage of silver because there is not enough gold in the country to run the finances." When he said this the amount of gold in circulation was \$498,449,242. Since then the amount of gold in the country has increased to \$814,063,155 in May, 1900, and is almost doubled. In this "enough" for Mr. Bryan, or his free silver some peculiar supernatural power over human affairs, that Mr. Bryan still insists on the 42-cent dollar? A cloud "with a silver lining" befores his eyes.