

BRYAN AN AGITATOR.

HIS EFFORT ALONG THE LINE IS TO STIR UP STRIFE.

Some of His Red Flag Expressions—An Apostle of Discontent Who Seeks to Arise Class Against Class.

Mr. Bryan apparently started out with the intention of discussing the coinage question as a question of pure finance and statesmanship. In his Madison Square Garden speech he said nothing which could be construed as an appeal to prejudice, unless perhaps it was his declaration that "there can be no sympathy or co-operation between the advocates of a universal gold standard and the advocates of bimetallism. Between bimetallism—whether independent or international—and a gold standard there is an impassable gulf." The question at issue in the present campaign is not, as Mr. Bryan would have the public believe, between bimetallism and the gold standard; it is between bimetallism and the silver standard. But when Mr. Bryan commenced speaking without notes the undertone of hatred and discussion which characterized his public utterances began to be distinctly audible.

By the time that he reached Syracuse he was in a frame of mind which led him to assert that men who do not favor silver monometallism are "enemies of this country, who think they are greater than the government and can make the government; their instrument for private gain, the greatest enemies that this country has." He called them "plunderers of the industrial masses, in behalf of the money corporations of this country and Europe."

At Erie, Pennsylvania, he acknowledged that he depended more upon an appeal to the emotions than to the intellects of his hearers, when he said:

"The heart is the place where conduct is determined, and if you want to find out where a man is in this fight do not look at his brain; that would find a reason for whatever his heart wants to do. Look at his heart, and find out where his sympathies are. * * * Show me the sympathies of a man and I will mark out his conduct. * * * Show me a man whose sympathies are with the idle holders of idle capital, and I will show you a man who wants as little money as possible, and puts it on the ground that he loves his neighbor better than himself. Show me a man whose sympathies are with the struggling masses, and I will show you a man who will never stand up for syndicates and consent to let them control the financial policy of the United States."

By the time that he reached Buffalo he began to sneer at his opponents, as, for instance, in the declaration that "when the Creator made man, he did not use any superior kind of mud when he made financiers." It was here that he said: "Advocates of bimetallism (he should have said silver monometallism) are called demagogues. There has never been a statesman whose heart beat in sympathy with the struggling masses who has not been called a demagogue by those who opposed him. Young man, do you want to know how to keep from being called a demagogue? I will give you a certain method. Get in the employ of some great corporation, and then call all the people anarchists, and you will be a statesman among your employers."

At Lockport, New York, he became denunciatory, and said: "They have driven down the price of your products, they have increased the burden of your debts, they have foreclosed your mortgages, they are degrading and lowering the standard of civilization by driving people who want to work upon the streets, and their idleness breeds crime, and crime menaces the safety of every citizen of the land." He expressed the belief that "the gold standard has made more misery for the human race than wars and pestilence and famines; more misery than human hand can conceive or human tongue can tell." He based his appeal to the passions of his hearers in the words: "The promulgation of the gold standard is an attack upon your homes and upon your families, and you have as much right to resist it as you have to resist an army marching to take your children captive and burn your roof over your head." Since a man has a right to resist an army by force, the only possible inference is that the friends of silver monometallism would be justified in a resort to violence to prevent the continuance of the present monetary system of the United States.

At Tonawanda he said that "the Chicago platform means that every man shall be defended in the enjoyment of that which he earns, but that no man shall be permitted to enjoy that which somebody else has earned and which is taken from him by violent legislation." This is a palpable threat of spoliation of the rich. "The platform," he continued, "is a menace to the wrong-doer—but the small wrong-doer only, but also the larger transgressor, who attempts to use the government as his instrument to wrong others." "This is an attack upon government and upon the principle of self-government. If the platform is a menace what would the election of Mr. Bryan be?"

At Toledo he gave the workmen some very bad and immoral advice in the words:

"I will not ask him to anything which may endanger his position. Let him wear the opposition button if he will. Let him put his name on their club list if he must. Let him contribute to their fund if he will. But let him remember there is one day in the year when he is his own master and can use a pencil as he pleases. I am willing for you to be Republicans every day in the year if you will just be Democrats on election day. I am willing for you to wear gold-bug buttons all the rest of the time if, when you enter the booth, you will remember that the gold standard never conferred a benefit upon those who toil, and that it was never endorsed or approved or sanctioned by any body of the people except those who hold fixed investments and trade in money or profit by the extremities of the government."

This was equivalent to advising workmen, whose friend he claims to be, to make of themselves liars, traitors, hypocrites and cowards, if only they would vote for him on the third of November. In the same speech he took a defiant attitude and said: "If I am elected the gold standard will not remain the stand-

ard of this country one moment longer than I can help to get rid of it."

At Toledo he said: "A Republican success would simply mean that while the people are nominally free they will be hewers of wood and drawers of water for those who control the money supply of the world." And again: "The people who intend to strike down one-half of all the standard money of the world simply mean to do with you and your property what the fleets of the world and the armies of the world would do if they came to destroy one-half of all your possessions."

At Milwaukee he described the present political campaign as a struggle over the question whether the people will "allow the host of the gold standard to enslave 70,000,000 of people, white and black, in this country." He said further: "They say that we are arraying one class of society against another. I deny it. But, my friends, if a burglar comes to my home I have a right to call all my family to keep him out, and it does not make me mad if, when he starts away, he turns around and shouts to me that I am trying to array my family against him. When men array themselves against society, society has a right to array itself against them. * * * The success of the Chicago ticket is dangerous only to the man who wants to eat the bread that somebody else earns."

In his speech at Lincoln, Nebraska, accepting the nomination of the silver Republicans, he said: "I believe that the gold standard is a conspiracy against the human race. I would no sooner join the ranks of those whose purpose it is to fasten it upon the people than enlist in an army that was marching to attack my home and destroy my family."

These extracts from Mr. Bryan's harangues give a fair idea of him as an agitator and fomenter of popular discord and commotion—a man who would risk the horrors of an armed conflict between citizens of the republic rather than fail of his election to the chair which he aspires to occupy. It is difficult to know whether he is to be taken seriously. He is either dangerous or absurd; dangerous if he succeeds in reaching the height of his ambition, but absurd if he fails of an election.

WHAT BRYAN SAID AND M'KINLEY DID.

An Object Lesson for Tin Plate Workers.

What Bryan SAID on tin plate: Mr. Raines, of New York: "When the industry of tin plate is established in the United States—and three months ago there was not a gentleman on that side who would admit that there was or would be a tin plate factory in the United States—"

Mr. Bryan: "We will not admit it to-day, sir." (Speech in House of Representatives, March 10, 1892.)

What McKinley DID on tin plate:

	Tons.
American tin plate manufactured 1892-1895.	290,000
American tin plate made, 1892-1895.	12,000
Actual product in four years.	212,000
Estimated product for 1896.	138,000

	Tons.
Practical results of McKinley's constructive legislation after five years.	350,000
Value of that industry during this time to the United States.	\$35,000,000

Number of wage-earners employed at the present time.	40,000
Average pay of men in mills, \$2.50 per day	
Number of tin plate mills, including dipping plants, brought into existence.	200

Result: Money kept at home, additional employment for American labor and a product cheaper and better than we have ever had before, and the buyers of tin plate won over to the wisdom of McKinley's protection policy.

Bryan said we could not make tin plate. McKinley has established the industry, and given employment to American workmen at good wages.

Laboring men! Which do you want? What Bryan SAID or McKinley DID?

WAGES AND COST OF LIVING IN JAPAN.

There are no more painstaking, methodical, accurate statisticians in the world than those of the new Japanese empire. Japan has published a report of the committee appointed to investigate its monetary system, which shows in various parts of the empire the average prices paid for all sorts of commodities for a long series of years past. A correspondent of the Cleveland World in Tokio, has taken the trouble to examine this report with care, and has furnished to that journal a table in detail showing the general rise in the cost of living in Tokio and Osaka since 1873. Taking the prices paid in 1873 as a unit and calling it 100, his table shows that in 1894 the price of rice must be stated at 165, of miso, 159; of table salt, 91; of soy, 158; of firewood, 141; of charcoal, 159; of cotton, 118; of rent, 228; of bath charges, 221. These are the principal items in the cost of living in Japan, and it is said that in 1894 the total cost of living is expressed by the figure 162 as compared with 100 in 1873. This is equivalent to saying that the cost of living has increased during twenty-one years by 62 per cent. on the average. The rise in prices is due to the decline in the purchasing power of silver which is turn is due to its depreciation in comparison with gold, or more properly speaking, to the greatly increased output of silver compared with the output of gold. The effect of this rise in prices upon persons with fixed income is stated as follows: "It will be seen that a petty official who could subsist in 1873 on ten yen a month required at the beginning of 1894, yen 16.20 to live in proportionate style, while a person who lived on 14.40 yen a month in 1886 required 26.20 yen eight years later. It is, therefore, easy to see that people living on petty fixed income, such as clerks in government service, whose income is practically stationary, must now be experiencing considerable difficulty in making ends meet, especially since house rent, which constitutes the largest item in the cost of living, is steadily going upward."

The same correspondent prints a table of wages of mechanics upon the same plan, which shows that if the average wage paid in 1873 was 100, the average wage paid in 1894 was 123, that is to say, wages had increased by one-third, or a little more than one-half as much as the cost of living. This statement is interesting and important in its relation to the fierce discussion now in progress between American workmen in favor of the election of Bryan and those in favor

of the election of McKinley, as to the effect of the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 upon their personal pecuniary interests. On the one hand, it is claimed that while free coinage will result in an increase in the prices demanded for commodities, wages will rise in proportion, so that a workman for his daily or weekly stipend can purchase as much comfort as he is able to purchase now. This is the claim of the Bryan men. The McKinley men deny it, and assert on the contrary, that while wages may rise slightly, they will not double as it is supposed that the prices of commodities will; therefore the workman, while he may receive a larger sum of money in return for his labor, the money will have less purchasing power and he will thereby receive less comfort. His condition, instead of being improved, will be worse than it now is. The experience of Japan since 1873 goes to show that the McKinley men have the best of the argument, and this experience is confirmed by the experience of all other countries on a silver basis, in which wages and prices have risen in consequence of the depreciation of silver. Wages never rise in proportion to prices. For this reason the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 would be an injury and not a benefit to the working men of the United States.

MR. BRYAN'S TARIFF DODGING.

The refusal of Mr. Bryan to discuss the tariff question is causing comment unfavorable to him. In view of the fact that while in congress Mr. Bryan was one of the most radical advocates of tariff reduction, in order to cheapen prices for the benefit of the people, whereas now he is urging that prices are too low, very naturally suggests that he was either insincere then in his plea for the people or he is insincere now. Cheapness was then the great desideratum with him. He railed against the "tariff robbers" and urged that a reduction of duties was necessary to give the people needed relief in lower prices for what they consumed. It was not the currency, but the economic policy of the Republican party which Mr. Bryan then regarded as the source of all ills. In a speech in the House of Representatives in 1892 Mr. Bryan characterized protection as a cannibal tree which had crushed the farmers within its folds and declared that the only thing needed to give relief to the farmers and to the masses of the people was tariff reform. There was no trouble with the currency, which was the same then that it is now. The whole trouble was with the tariff.

Referring to the attitude of Mr. Bryan when in Congress and his present attitude, the New York Times says: "For some years and up to a recent date, Mr. Bryan, in and out of Congress, earnestly and constantly demanded a great reduction of tariff duties and urged that many dutiable products should be placed upon the free list, because, as he contended, the prices of the necessities of life ought to be reduced for the benefit of the people. The tariff, he said, made prices unwarrantably and unjustly high; the interests of the masses required that these prices and the cost of living should be cut down. Now he asserts that the prices of the necessities of life are very much too low and that they were too low at the very time when he was saying that they were too high and was exerting his influence to reduce them. He proclaims the doctrine that the cost of those things by which life is sustained should be increased—not decreased—by legislation and advocates a policy designed to increase it. It was, he said, for the benefit of the masses that he then called for legislation that would decrease this cost; it is, he says, for the benefit of the masses that he now demands legislation that will increase it. Why should he not desire to avoid any discussion or any expression of opinion that would exhibit this difference in this evidence of inconsistency? Mr. Bryan in 1892 and in 1894 did his part and did it well in denouncing the tariff and in urging that it be reduced. He does not now dare attempt a defense of his course, the disastrous effects of which are known to everybody. He is now engaged in another effort to divide and mislead the people, but what he now proposes is far more dangerous to the welfare and prosperity of the country than the policy of tariff reduction he advocated in Congress. In order to reduce prices, that policy has done great harm to all interests and especially to the agricultural and the labor interests, but it is trifling in comparison to the injury that would be wrought by the free coinage of silver. Mr. Bryan has the very best of reasons for avoiding discussion of the tariff question. He cannot defend the results of the policy for which he is in part responsible. Having deceived the people once, to their immeasurable loss, will he be allowed to do so again? No one can think so who has any faith in popular intelligence.—Omaha Bee.

of the McKinley men, as to the effect of the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 upon their personal pecuniary interests. On the one hand, it is claimed that while free coinage will result in an increase in the prices demanded for commodities, wages will rise in proportion, so that a workman for his daily or weekly stipend can purchase as much comfort as he is able to purchase now. This is the claim of the Bryan men. The McKinley men deny it, and assert on the contrary, that while wages may rise slightly, they will not double as it is supposed that the prices of commodities will; therefore the workman, while he may receive a larger sum of money in return for his labor, the money will have less purchasing power and he will thereby receive less comfort. His condition, instead of being improved, will be worse than it now is. The experience of Japan since 1873 goes to show that the McKinley men have the best of the argument, and this experience is confirmed by the experience of all other countries on a silver basis, in which wages and prices have risen in consequence of the depreciation of silver. Wages never rise in proportion to prices. For this reason the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 would be an injury and not a benefit to the working men of the United States.

The silver Democrats and the Populists do not say very much about the "Anarchy plank" in their platform. Yet Mr. Bryan declared in his letter of acceptance that he approves of that plank with all the rest. Here are the planks as they appear in the two platforms. The first is the Chicago plank and the second is the St. Louis plank.

AN ADVOCATE OF ANARCHY.

The silver Democrats and the Populists do not say very much about the "Anarchy plank" in their platform. Yet Mr. Bryan declared in his letter of acceptance that he approves of that plank with all the rest. Here are the planks as they appear in the two platforms. The first is the Chicago plank and the second is the St. Louis plank.

We denounce arbitrary interference by federal authorities in local affairs as a violation of the Constitution of the United States and crime against free institutions, and we especially object to government by injunction as a new and highly dangerous form of oppression.

"I have carefully considered the platform adopted by the Democratic National convention, and unqualifiedly endorse every plank thereon," says Mr. Bryan. In his Labor day address, Mr. Bryan told workmen that the government should provide some way in which they could settle their differences with capital "instead of resorting to violence to settle them." So he declares violence one means of settlement. Thus he proclaims himself beyond all doubt or cavil, an advocate of anarchy.—Buffalo, (N. Y.) News.

POWDERLY AT COOPER UNION.

It was not strange that an organized effort was made to disturb the proceedings at Cooper Union at the wage-earners' meeting on Thursday evening, and by riotous interruptions prevent Mr. Powderly from obtaining a hearing. Not strange at all, but entirely characteristic of the methods and the maneuvers of that faction in the labor movement which has been striving for years to prostitute and degrade the movement for their own selfish purposes. They are marketable, and both violent and lawless. It has not been the practice, even in our most exciting political campaigns, for the emissaries of an opposition party to invade the meetings of their opponents in turbulent and disorderly gangs with the sole view of creating disturbance and inciting riot. But the fellows who endeavored to break up the Cooper Union meeting with hisses and howls and catcalls, in order to prevent decent and law-abiding citizens from hearing Mr. Powderly deliver what every one who either heard or read it must admit was a perfectly calm, logical and reasonable exposition of the issues of the campaign, were of the new order of political disputants—the sort engendered by the doctrines of the Chicago platform, and accurately represented by the Boy Orator and his anarchist following. Their highest conception of political discussion consists in drowning the arguments of their opponents by unmeaning noise; their only answer to calm and intelligent statement is lawlessness and disorder.

The only purpose of these diabolical of the Boy Orator was to prevent Mr. Powderly from obtaining a hearing. In so doing they were only exemplifying the principles of the Chicago platform, only following, and bettering in but small degree, the instructions of the candidate who has for the last two months been engaged in inciting just such demonstrations by appeals to the ignorance and the lawless passions of those whom he calls the toiling masses. But why should they make this violent and disgraceful demonstration against Mr. Powderly? They pretend to be laboring men, and to be actuated by a sincere desire to promote the interest of laboring men; to make labor itself not only worthy its hire from a material point of view, but deserving of the highest consideration, both from its inestimable consequence as the most important factor in the world's progress and from the intelligence with which its responsibilities are weighed and its duties considered. They pretend, in short, to be the special advocates of the rights, and the champions of the dignity of labor. It was under color of this advocacy, and by virtue of this championship, that they set themselves on Thursday night in Cooper Union not to listen to the arguments of an opponent, of their own class, in order to be able to answer them—nor, indeed, to answer them on the spot with some show of order and plan—but simply to suppress his argument by lawless disorder and howl or hiss him down unheard, by mere noise.

And who is Terence V. Powderly, that these so-called and self-styled advocates of the rights of labor should with such deliberation and set purpose undertake to howl and hiss down in a community whose boast is the freedom of speech, which under law is accorded and by law protected? His record as a labor leader answers the inquiry. He was for many years the highest officer of the organization of Knights of Labor, the most successful association of its kind ever known in this country. Under his administration it was the most respected and influential. No combination of workmen had ever commanded such respect, and certainly none had ever made its influence and power so universally felt, as the Knights of Labor under his administration. Self-poised and firm, he was no less conservative and conciliatory, and his administration was marked by more real advancement for the cause of labor and more actual achievements in its behalf than were ever known before or since. His policy was opposed by the demagogues and agitators in the labor movement whose only conception of the labor question is that there is, and must necessarily always be, bitter and relentless war between the employer and the employed; constant contention those men made their living. Labor strikes were and are their opportunities. Reconciliations and mutual understandings were and are the destruction of their business as agitators, and consequently the bane of their existence. They put Powderly out in 1893. Since then that queer counterpart of the Boy Orator, Mr. Sovereign, has been wabbling round in his place, making more noise in a minute than Powderly did in a year, and doing a thousand times more mischief in the same time Powderly ever did.

The labor movement has been divided into two distinct parties ever since Powderly was deposed. Powderly addressed with his own method and his own line of argument one of these divisions the other night at Cooper Union. The other division met him in their own way, with their own manners, and by their own and only method. The result was that Mr. Powderly was heard, and his disturbers had to be ejected by the police. The lesson cannot be lost upon honest laboring men, who desire to hear both sides and form their own judgments upon political questions and do not believe in the suppression of free speech.—New York Tribune.

M'KINLEY EXCELS HIMSELF.

The steel and iron industry has been quoted as the barometer of trade, and it is true that when the steel mills, the forges, the great foundries, the nail mills, the huge establishments in which structural iron and the thousands and household articles and implements of agriculture or of mechanics are busy the whole community is prosperous. There may be exceptional causes leading to exceptional activity in one or two of the many branches of the great iron and steel industry while the general commerce of the nation languishes, but it universally is true that when all the branches of the iron trade are vigorous the whole country is prosperous, and when all of them are lifeless the whole country is prostrated.

This condition gives peculiar significance to the visit made to Major McKinley by 2,000 wage-earners from the steel works at Braddock, Pennsylvania. The voice of these men is representative in the voice of the nation. They are men who have passed through a season of adversity; they have suffered from reduced wages and from lessened hours of work, the savings of the prudent have melted in the slow fire of enforced idleness. These men have digested their own case correctly; they know "what is the matter." They have been prosperous under protection and unprosperous under reduced tariffs. They want to an experienced and sympathetic physician in quest of a remedial prescription.

They talked to McKinley and he answered them in fit words: "I did you welcome to my city and to my home. I can well appreciate why the workmen of this country should have a deep and profound interest in the outcome of the present national contest. I cannot fail to remember that one thing which stands between your labor and the labor of Europe—the one thing which stands between your workshops and the workshops of the old world. It is a wise, patriotic, American protective policy."

There are two qualities that strive for pre-eminence in the nature of Major McKinley—sound common sense and unaffected brotherly feeling toward those whom Mr. Bryan delights to call "the plain common people" as if they were of a class to which he stoops from the height of a real or supposed intellectual supremacy, but to whom and of whom McKinley always speaks as "my fellow citizens." These two characteristics never have been more fully displayed than in his address to the iron and steel workers. An ostentatious man would have seized the opportunity for a display of his scholarship in economics, and in so doing would have "multiplied words without wisdom." The Republican nominee went right to the root of the matter in less than twenty words: "We know that the present monetary standard has not stood in the way of our prosperity in the past." ("Cries of 'No, no; free trade has.'")

The extreme gold men and the extreme silver men alike are in error. "The present monetary standard has not stood in the way of our prosperity in the past." Nor will it in the future. It is an excellent system; it makes the silver dollars as good as gold for the purchase of all things and for the payment of all debts; it prevents the paper currency from becoming depreciated or irredeemable. The Republican party is pledged to its maintenance. The Democratic party is pledged to its destruction.

After this display of the soundest quality of sound sense the distinguished host of the visiting workmen gave utterance to sentiments of the truest patriotism and of the most implicit confidence in the good intent of his countrymen: "My fellow citizens, it is gratifying to me to be assured by your spokesman and my old comrade—it will be inspiring to the whole country—that the voice of labor here to-day declares that no party which degrades the honor of the nation, no party which stands opposed to law and order, or which seeks to array the masses against the classes, shall receive its vote and support. Golden words are these, which will strike a chord in every American's heart where virtue dwells and truth abides."

"We have this year resting upon us as citizens a grave responsibility. The country has never failed or faltered in the past to meet every crisis. It will not falter or fail now to uphold the dignity and independence of labor and the honor and stability of the government, that it may still further exalt the American name."

Here is no demagogic flattery of "the intelligence of the plain common people," no shoddy rhetoric upon "the crucifixion of labor," but just a manly appeal to the patriotism and good sense of his fellow citizens and an expression of confidence in the exercise of their duty at the coming election. Major McKinley has done well in all his efforts, but in his address to the iron and steel workers he excelled himself.—Chicago Inter Ocean.

BRYAN IS PREACHING TREASON.

Attorney General Harmon turns the flank of Bryanism neatly when he quotes Senator Daniel of Virginia against Chairman Daniel of the Popocratic convention in relation to the subject of "Federal interference," co-called, with the assumed rights of mobs to violate the laws of the United States.

Senator Daniel introduced in the senate that ringing resolution which upheld Mr. Cleveland in his suppression by military force of the interference of lawless men "with the transportation of the mails of the United States and with commerce among the states." It was Senator Daniel who presided over that maniac convention that propounded the assurance that the president had no constitutional right to do that very thing which Senator Daniel formally and vigorously approved his doing.

It requires some little patience on the part of men familiar with the organic law of the Union to gravely meet and refute the wild assertion of ignoramus and blatherskites, but Mr. Harmon has simply to submit sections 5,207 and 5,208 of the revised statutes to prove the obligation on the president to employ force against unlawful obstructions "in whatever state or territory thereof the laws of the United States may be forcibly opposed or the execution thereof obstructed." The doctrine laid down by Aigled, adopted by the Popocracy and proclaimed from the stump by Bryan the attorney general rightly declares to be more dangerous than the doctrine of secession. The only plea for Bryan and his earnest followers is that of shameful ignorance of the law. Ignorance of the law, however, is not a valid defense.

This man is preaching treason and fools are applauding him because they know no better.—New York Commercial Advertiser.

The Old Song.
Young Sewall made a speech or two
Before the Maine election,
He talked against the silver craze
And told of his defection,
His speeches they were heard and read,
They caused the hosts to gather,
They piled up 80,000 votes,
And the blow it near killed father."

It is all right to make a campaign of education. But the effort of the Democratic leaders to array the poor against the rich, and make labor and capital enemies, is evil, and wholly evil.

BRYAN AND THE TARIFF.

Candidate Bryan shows a kind of shifty shrewdness in his avoidance of the issue which his party has made the focus of its every campaign for many many years, until now. He says: "What ever may be the individual views of citizens as to the relative merits of protection and tariff reform, all must recognize that until the money question is fully and finally settled, the American people will not consent to the consideration of any other important question." If he had said that the American people, having tried tariff reform, and declared themselves very, very sick of it, and were determined to return to the principles of protection and stay there, he would have found the truth embarrassing, as usual. Therefore, he acted shrewdly, according to his standard of practical prudence in saying as little as possible on the subject, and making that little take the form of a claim that the people are not interested in the subject.

Nevertheless, the Democratic party stands pledged by many planks in many national platforms to oppose the protective principle, and remains committed by its action of scarcely more than four years ago to the doctrine that protection is unconstitutional and must be extirpated root and branch. A party cannot change its principles as a man can change his shirt, every time a change seems to be temporarily convenient. A party is responsible for its history and its declarations in the past as well as in the present. It may indeed undergo development, growth and gradual change, but only as an individual, by rational processes and in accordance with relations of cause and effect. A party cannot, merely by ignoring a subject or saying something noncommittal about it, relieve itself of all responsibility for what it has said and done in relation to that matter through all its previous existence.

The tariff question is one regarding which American voters are deeply interested in this campaign, and millions of them are impatiently looking forward to November 3, next, as the time when they will have a chance to express themselves on the subject at the ballot box. No matter how much this year's candidate for the presidency on the Democratic ticket may try to run away and hide from the tariff question, the voters will not forget that he is the candidate of a party which stands pledged by unrepudiated platform declarations to turn over the markets of this country to the unrestrained competition of foreign capital and labor, and that the long continued industrial stagnation in this country has followed an attempt of the Democratic party to carry out its schemes in that respect; an attempt which the party leaders have declared to be only the first step in the way that they intend the country to travel.—Boston Advertiser.

THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

The freedom of speech and right in a country like the United States, where every citizen has his say, can only be maintained by jealously guarding the public utterances. It should be deemed a menace to everyone when any individual descends to incendiary or anarchistic talk to accomplish a purpose. If anyone violates this principle, it should always be taken against him, and in the case of a political candidate, it should defeat him, as the people cannot afford to trust an intertempore or an incendiary man, and they don't need to. The difference between earnestness and anarchy in speech is no clearly defined that there need be no mistake.

When Bryan, in his speech at Chicago, said burn down your cities, etc., he gave the key to his whole scheme and character. If the public trusts him after such a note of warning it must expect an incendiary government, dangerous at all times alike to friend and foe. Bryan will undoubtedly be beaten by his own party. It is justly ashamed of him. He is not even a Democrat. His party found it necessary to get away from him entirely and hold another convention and nominate a Democrat to get away from the stampe and riot at Chicago that adopted a platform that must sink any candidate that stands on it. Never mind Bryan's promises for free silver to all voters if he is not to be trusted by his own party. If a bad man tried to assure us of a good thing we would all be slow to believe him. Here is a man posing as a Democrat without any Democracy and so bad that the best men in his own party cannot and will not trust him, but find it necessary to go and hold a convention and nominate a Democrat so as to beat him if possible. Instead of preaching to the public Mr. Bryan should privately and religiously try to make peace with and satisfy the good men of his own party that he and his 16 to 1 and his anarchy and burn down your cities is right. His position before the country at the present time is that of a man utterly discredited by the best men in what he claims is his own Democratic party, many of them tried and trusted Democrats and patriots before he was old enough to blat. The pledges, promises and threats of such a man as Bryan must fall flat in the face of such facts. Bryan's boasted eloquence must be devoid of sense and argument when he can not convince millions of conceded Democrats that he is not a menace to the country and its business interests. He must have tried it on the dog at Chicago to stampede the convention, but the medicine is no good when offered to real Democrats, and the real Democrats in the Chicago convention even rebelled. We are told level-headed certain subjects can. We can easily place Bryan among the hypnotists when he handled enough subjects at Chicago to get nominated and fell flat before a level-headed crowd here. Such a man, with such a nerve, could only succeed like Svengali.—New York Dispatch.

Chips That Pass in the Night.

Bryan's boom seems to be drifting in splinters toward Salt River.—New York Commercial Advertiser.

It is not well to lose sight of the fact that the deficiency in the treasury under the Wilson tariff is steadily increasing. And the matter of raising revenue has nothing to do with the question of coinage.

(SPECIAL NUMBER ONE.)