

THE SECOND BATTLE

OR

THE NEW DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

1776-1900

AN ACCOUNT OF THE STRUGGLE OF 1900

AS DISCUSSED IN SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF

HON. WILLIAM J. ^WBRYAN AND OTHERS

ISSUED BY

W. B. CONKEY COMPANY

PUBLISHERS OF

HON. WM. J. BRYAN'S "THE FIRST BATTLE"

CHICAGO, ILL.

[C 1900]

MRS

311

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

962188A

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1938 L

COPYRIGHT, 1900, BY W. B. CONKEY COMPANY.



Yours truly
W. J. Bryan



Mary Baird Bryan

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

	PAGE.
Portrait of Hon. W. J. Bryan.....	Frontispiece
Portrait of Mary Baird Bryan.....	Frontispiece
Exterior of Kansas City Convention Hall.....	16
Democratic Convention Hall, Chicago, 1896...	17
National Democratic Campaign Committee....	32
Scene at Democratic Convention during Reading of Platform.....	33
The Bryan Family on the Day of the Nomination	48
The Library in the Lincoln Home.....	49
Portrait of Ruth Baird Bryan.....	64
Portrait of William Jennings Bryan, Jr.....	65
Portrait of Grace Dexter Bryan.....	80
Exterior View of Lincoln Home.....	81
Mr. Bryan Preparing a Political Speech.....	96
A Corner in the Bryan Parlor.....	97
Mrs. Bryan's Favorite Occupation.....	112
Mr. Bryan on his Farm.....	113
Hard at Work.....	128
Mr. Bryan's Bust Carried into Convention Hall	129
Mr. Bryan's Bust Unveiled amid Great Enthusiasm	144
Executive Members of Campaign Committee in Private Session.....	145
View of Main Body of Delegates.....	160
Northwestern Delegates Listening to Senator Tillman's Speech.....	161

	PAGE.
The Heads of the New York Delegation.....	176
In the Reporters' Corner.....	177
A. E. Stevenson.....	192
Arthur Sewall.....	193
Charles A. Towne.....	224
B. R. Tillman.....	225
James K. Jones.....	256
John P. Altgeld.....	257
H. M. Teller.....	288
Horace Chilton.....	289
William V. Allen.....	320
George F. Edmunds.....	321
John W. Daniel.....	352
J. B. Weaver.....	353
G. G. Vest.....	384
George F. Hoar.....	385
Stephen M. White.....	416
H. D. Money.....	417
A. P. Gorman.....	448
Francis G. Newlands.....	449
Marion Butler.....	480
William J. Stone.....	481
W. H. Harvey.....	512
A. J. Warner.....	513
Horace Boies.....	544
J. C. S. Blackburn.....	545

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE.
The Contest Begins.....	9

CHAPTER II.

Democratic Platform for 1900.....	39
-----------------------------------	----

CHAPTER III.

Biography of Hon. W. J. Bryan.....	45
------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER IV.

Speeches and Interviews of W. J. Bryan on Imperialism:	
Intervention in Cuba.....	83
First Speech Against Imperialism.....	84
The Savannah Interview.....	87
National Emblem.....	89
Who Saves his Country Saves himself.....	91
Cincinnati Speech.....	92
Jackson Day Speech at Chicago.....	97
Naboth's Vineyard.....	100
Liberty, not Conquest.....	102
It Rests with the People.....	103
America's Mission.....	107

CHAPTER V.

Articles by W. J. Bryan on Imperialism:	
Jefferson <i>versus</i> Imperialism.....	114
The Army.....	120
Ratify the Treaty, Declare the Nation's Policy.....	126
Will it Pay?.....	132
British Rule in India.....	141
What Next?.....	153

CHAPTER VI.

Bryan's Baltimore Speech.....	160
-------------------------------	-----

	PAGE.
CHAPTER VII.	
Bryan's Anti-Trust Speech.....	205
CHAPTER VIII.	
National Silver Republicans.....	239
CHAPTER IX.	
Unconditional Repeal.....	249
CHAPTER X.	
Democratic Differences.....	294
CHAPTER XI.	
Chicago Platform Speech.....	304
CHAPTER XII.	
Continuation of the Struggle.....	311
CHAPTER XIII.	
The Issue Defined.....	318
CHAPTER XIV.	
The Presidential Nomination.....	326
CHAPTER XV.	
The Election Returns.....	334
CHAPTER XVI.	
Effect of Annexation—By John W. Daniel.....	339
CHAPTER XVII.	
Are we to Spread the Christian Religion with the Bayonet Point, as Mahomet Spread Islamism with a Scimiter?—By Benjamin R. Tillman.....	396
CHAPTER XVIII.	
Annexation from a Legal Point of View—By George G. Vest.....	411

	PAGE.
CHAPTER XIX.	
The Passing of Constitutional Restraints—By Stephen M. White.....	430
CHAPTER XX.	
Large Standing Armies a Menace to a Republic—By Arthur P. Gorman.....	458
CHAPTER XXI.	
A Nation's Power—By Henry M. Teller.....	465
CHAPTER XXII.	
What Will They Do to Us?—By George F. Edmunds.....	481
CHAPTER XXIII.	
A Government Based on Force—By Marion Butler.....	490
CHAPTER XXIV.	
A Republic Can Have No Subjects—By Adlai E. Stevenson	494
CHAPTER XXV.	
Necessary and Natural Territorial Expansion—By William V. Allen.....	508
CHAPTER XXVI.	
"Lest We Forget"—By Charles A. Towne.....	526
CHAPTER XXVII.	
Annexation Dangerous to Labor—By Horace R. Chilton....	550

THE SECOND BATTLE.

CHAPTER I.

THE CONTEST BEGINS

The Democratic National Convention was called to order by Chairman Jones at exactly 12 o'clock, July 4, 1900, in Kansas City, Mo. The great Exposition Hall contained over twenty thousand people, and the enthusiasm and heat was intense. The formal call for the convention was read by Secretary Walsh, and prayer was offered by the Rev. S. W. Neel, of Kansas City. Chairman Jones then presented James A. Reed, Mayor of Kansas City, who formally welcomed the delegates to the city. A delegate from Michigan then moved that the Declaration of Independence be read as a rebuke to the Republican party, and this was carried amid great applause. The singing of the "Star Spangled Banner" and "America" by the entire convention aroused the greatest patriotic demonstration of the day, unless it was the entrance of ex-Senator David B. Hill. He was defeated for a place on the Resolution Committee by his own delegation, and his appearance in the convention hall stirred the delegates, and cries of "Hill, Hill," delayed the work of the convention for over half an hour. The committee on organization reported the names of Governor Charles S. Thomas, of Colorado, for temporary chairman, and he was escorted to the platform by Major Rose, of Milwaukee, and Congressman Lentz, of Ohio, his defeated rivals for the position. He was introduced to the convention by Chairman Jones. Owing to the great confusion in the hall, caused by the delegates still yelling

for Hill, it was some time before order was obtained, and the regular business of the convention proceeded with. At this juncture a bust of William J. Bryan was unveiled on the platform, and the perspiring delegates yelled themselves hoarse. When quiet had been secured, Temporary Chairman Thomas advanced to the edge of the platform, and spoke as follows:

"Mr. Chairman: We meet under most auspicious influences. On the nation's birthday, in a great central city of the Republic, at the close and opening of a century, we come together to reaffirm our allegiance to the principles of Thomas Jefferson and our loyalty to their greatest living exponent. We have been selected by the farmer and the artisan, the miner and the mechanic, the producers of wealth in every State and Territory of this mighty nation to register a decree they have already determined, to proclaim a candidate they have already chosen.

"We come not with the pomp and circumstance of consolidated wealth, but as the delegates of the plain people, who believe that all men were created equal and that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. We are not here as the representatives of the vast interests which dominate every industrial life, but as the champion of the individual citizen who stands helpless in their presence.

"We speak not for those who would pivot the finances of the world upon a single metal, supplementing its inadequacy by a paper currency issued by a private monopoly at the expense of the people, but for the millions who believe in the money of the constitution and in the ability of their countrymen to legislate for themselves, without the previous permission of foreign parliaments, potentates, or princes.

"The line of division between political forces became, therefore, sharply defined in 1896 upon what was called the money question. That question involved, as we then asserted, and as we now know, every other economic problem. It embraced within its wide limitations the issues of labor and capital, of combination and competition, of production, transportation, and distribution.

"It was predicted that the defeat of bimetallism would be followed by the retirement of all forms of government currency, by the dedication of the power of note issue to the holders of the national obligation, the practical consolidation of all lines of transportation, and the consequent domination of every commercial pursuit by a score of colossal monopolies. These predictions have in general been verified.

"Democratic defeat had scarcely been recorded when the march of consolidation was resumed. Every pursuit that engages the attention of man has been exploited, capitalized, and appropriated. The earth and the water round about it have been explored for sub-

jects of monopoly, and those who have thundered against unsound money have used the printing press and the engravers' art to turn out thousands of millions of fictitious values, to whose profit the toilers and consumers pay constant tribute.

"Hence the crisis in our commercial affairs, whose issue, presented in acute form to the voters of 1900, is that of industrial despotism, as against the liberty of the citizen.

"Democracy wages no war against wealth. Under her beneficent rule its creation and amassment have ever been among the most worthy objects of human effort. The desire for material comfort and well-being is the mainspring of progress. The wealth that comes as the reward of honest industry and thrift commands and must receive the encouragement and protection of all.

"But the wealth that comes through partnership with the government, which usurps its prerogatives and perverts its agencies, which absorbs the resources and blasts the opportunities of the individual, crushes competition, levies tribute on the producer, and corrupts and poisons all branches of official life, and reduces the citizen to dependence upon its will, excites our just apprehensions.

"Modern monopoly is the offspring of the Republican party. It is the genius of organized commercialism. It has neither conscience, sentiment, nor patriotism. It knows neither justice nor morality. It blacklists the workingman and sets him adrift to starve in the midst of plenty. It is the enemy of democracy, which has accepted its gage of battle. Either the trust or the government must disappear.

"At the demand of the so-called financial interests the present Congress has enacted a new currency law. By its terms the government has presented to the national banks twenty-five millions of dollars, given them control of our circulation, provided for the payment in cash of the premium values of the greater part of its bonds, and created a perpetual national debt. It has declared for the payment of all obligations in gold, stricken from its contracts the reserved right of the government to use its own money for the payment of debts, and delegated to private interest the power to supplement all deficiencies in the circulation medium by the paper money whose volume they shall regulate and which the people are taxed to support.

"The greenback and the Treasury note are retired, an inert mass of \$150,000,000 in gold is to be kept in the Treasury by the issue of bonds whenever necessary, the currency must shrink and swell as the judgment of selfishness shall dictate, and the pretended menace of bimetallism against 'sound money' and the national honor has been evaded.

"Against this iniquitous scheme of finance democracy protests. We will have no money system founded upon the public debt and dictated by those who hold it. We stand for the gold and silver of the constitution. For a paper currency founded upon them and issued by the Government as the embodiment of our sovereignty.

"Those who assert that the money question is dead have given but little heed to the lessons of experience. It can never die until it shall receive the righteous solution.

"The prevailing sentiment of Democratic sympathy for all people struggling for the blessings of liberty compelled the administration two years ago to interfere with the despotic tyranny of Spain over Cuba and secured to the oppressed people of that island the right of self-government. Our ultimatum delivered, we solemnly and officially declared them to be free and independent, and disclaimed to the world any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over the island except for the pacification thereof, and asserted our determination when that was accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

"The conditions of the ensuing war sent Admiral Dewey to the distant Philippines, where another people, engaged in the same struggle with the same oppressor, appealed to the same impulses of our nature. There he broke the power of Spain, which, suing for peace, submitted to the liberation of Cuba and the cession of Porto Rico.

"Our Government disdained the spirit of its manifesto of April, and became the purchaser of the Philippines in January. Since then we have given Cuba the benefit of our civic institutions by governing her through the War department.

"We have kept faith with Porto Rico by substituting the sugar baron for the Castilian Duke, and confirmed the Philippine estimate of the white man by prolonging the Spaniards' method of colonial government in those islands of the far-off seas.

"The national sympathy for all who seek self-government has been made the instrument by which cupidity and greed hold a feeble nation in thralldom. The right of purchase is invoked to justify the adoption of a so-called colonial policy by the great Western republic, and her glorious institutions are declared to be for home consumption, with prohibitive duties against their exportation.

"Imperialism has become a favorite word in the national vocabulary. Destiny is the name of its fateful brother. Trade expansion is the mystic verbal tie that binds them.

"We have cheerfully submitted to a burdensome taxation that Cuba might be free; that Porto Rico might enjoy the heritage of our constitution. We have consecrated our sons to the cause of liberty and sent them freely forth to extinguish the last vestige of despotism in our hemisphere. We protest against payment of tribute or the devotion of life to the cause of empire.

"We realize that a standing army is the attendant of imperialism. We would avoid the latter, because once avowed as a national policy, it must undermine our domestic institutions. We would have no colonial system. It cannot live in the atmosphere of freedom. It is an asylum of dishonesty and incompetency. Our national standard has a stripe for every State that forms the Union, a star for every commonwealth of the sisterhood. It has neither place nor emblem for subject people or colonial systems.

"We would form political alliances with no countries whatever. We neither need nor desire them. For a century and a quarter we have survived the envies and the enmities of Europe. We have

flourished notwithstanding the civil and foreign conflicts of that eventful period.

"When we were weak, confronted with the embarrassments of distracting internal dissensions, with a government of ill defined authority, with undeveloped resources and a sparse population, our friendship was scorned, our strength despised.

"To-day we are sought by the nations which would utilize our strength and profit by our association. We are reminded of the difference between blood and water, of the identity of mere speech and origin, of the tremendous advantages that must accrue to us through an alliance with kin beyond the sea.

"These and other considerations, continually suggested and favorably received, justify our protest against any bond of international union. It is as true now as ever that 'It is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.'

"We would relieve the people of the burden of taxation. The Treasury is bursting with a plethoric revenue, millions whereof are deposited with favorite banks and the taxation goes on although the Spanish-American conflict ended eight months ago. Notwithstanding these conditions there is no surcease of taxation.

"We would have for our Chief Magistrate a man sprung from the loins of the people, rock-ribbed in his convictions and controlled by the admonitions of his conscience. A man of lofty ideals and steadfast courage. A man to whom his country's constitution appears as a living and sacred reality. A man who exalts the duties, the rights, and the welfare of his fellow-citizens above the sinister and corroding influences of centralized commercialisms. A man whose ear is untuned to the pulsations of the pocketbook, but responsive to the heart-throbs of the masses.

"We want no man of plastic mold, conforming his opinions to passing impressions of popular sentiment, as facile in their abandonment as in their advocacy. We want a man to whom right is greater than expediency, who postpones no duty to the demand of privilege, who is loved by the multitude, respected by the world, and feared only by those who distrust the people.

"The Republican party boast of almost unbroken rule for nearly forty years. The emancipator of the negro, it has fostered those commercial conditions which are fast establishing a system of industrial slavery. More recently declaring for Cuban independence it scarcely disguises its present purpose to absorb that island.

"There was a time when it put its trusts in the people. Since then it has put the people in its trusts.

"Its battle cry years ago was 'Freedom and the Union.' If due credit be given to one of its modern leaders its motto for 1900 is 'Gold and Glory.'

"Against the continuance of this party in power we enter protest. With the man exalted above the dollar, the constitution against

the combination, the equality of all before the law, with solemn promises to correct the abuses of administration, and to enforce those fundamentals of government which secure exact justice to all, we shall not appeal in vain to the wisdom, the intelligence, and the patriotism of the American people."

The call of States began for naming the members of the various committees. The Chairman announced that the Committee on Credentials was not ready yet to report and the convention adjourned until 8:30 p. m.

At 8:30 p. m., Chairman Thomas rapped the convention to order and there was scarcely two-thirds of the delegates in attendance.

As the committees were not prepared to report the Chairman announced that ex Governor Altgeld of Illinois would address the convention. Mr. Altgeld spoke with great earnestness and his speech was intended to stiffen the backbone of the radical faction and offset the Hill demonstration. Just at his peroration someone mentioned Hill. That was a signal. In two seconds the convention was a fine imitation of Donnybrook all over the hall. Everybody was shouting Hill, Hill. The Chairman was very angry, and finally when there was a lull in the hilarity he rushed through the report of the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Permanent Organization reported in favor of Hon. John D. Richardson of Tennessee, as permanent chairman; and that the officers of the temporary organization be made permanent.

The Chair appointed Messrs. McCreary of Kentucky, Daniel Campau of Michigan and Mayor Phelan of San Francisco to escort the permanent Chairman to the platform. After being introduced Mr. Richardson repeatedly bowed his acknowledgments of the cheers that swept in wave after wave through the great Convention Hall.

Chairman Richardson said:

"I am deeply sensible of the great honor you have bestowed upon me in calling me to preside over this great Democratic convention. We have been clothed with the authority to formally name the candidates who at the next election are to be chosen President and Vice-President of the United States, and to lay down a platform of principles upon which the battle is to be fought and the victory won. With your permission I will address myself to some of the issues of the impending campaign.

"The last great national contest for supremacy was fought mainly upon one issue—that is to say, one issue was paramount in the struggle. That issue was familiarly called, '16 to 1.' It involved the question of the free coinage of gold and silver at a ratio of sixteen parts of silver to one part of gold, with which all of us are familiar.

"The momentous issue this year is again '16 to 1,' but the sixteen parts to the one part of this campaign, which I will briefly discuss, are wholly different from those of 1866. I will first refer to the sixteen parts and then to the one part. These sixteen parts are:

"First, we have the issue fraught with indescribable importance to our people native born, and those who have for patriotic reasons cast their fortunes with us—namely: that of the republic against the empire. On this part alone of the sixteen, if there were no other, we confidently expect to win a sweeping victory in November. The Republican party stands for empire. The Democratic party stands for the republic, for the Declaration of Independence, and the constitution of our country.

"Second—The paternal and fostering care given by those with whom we contend, to the combinations of corporations and companies into powerful organizations, familiarly known as trusts. Under three years of Republican rule, while they controlled the Presidency, the Senate, and the House of Representatives—that is, all of the law-making power of the government—trusts have been propagated and fostered by legislation until they not only dominate all markets, both the buying and selling, but defy the power of the Government itself.

"The farcical efforts put forth by the Republican party in an alleged attempt to restrain them in the dying hours of the late session of Congress only excited ridicule and contempt and served to emphasize their inability and disinclination to grapple the monsters and regulate their conduct and actions. No matter what their excuses may be, the fact is that their policies have created them, and, though clothed with all power, they refuse to enact legislation to control them.

"Third—Called to power on March 4, 1897, under a pledge to reform the currency, they seized the first opportunity to fasten upon the land the highest protective tariff law ever put upon the statute books of any country.

"This law was enacted not to raise revenue but to give protection to favored manufacturers. It failed to raise sufficient revenue

for the government, but answered the purpose of enriching the favored few, while it robbed the many, and at the same time brought forth trusts to plague us as numerous as the lice and locusts of Egypt. Their high protective tariff is the mother of trusts.

"Fourth—This administration came into power with a solemn declaration in favor of bimetallism and a pledge to promote it. It has failed to keep that pledge. It has erected in its stead the single standard of gold, and has endeavored to destroy all hope of bimetallism. In doing this it has built up a powerful national bank trust and has given us a currency based upon the debts and liabilities of the government. We stand for bimetallism and not for a monometallic standard of either one or the other metal.

"Fifth—The dominant party has recently made the fraudulent declaration that it favored the Monroe doctrine, and yet their President and Secretary of State have done all in their power to nullify and abrogate that famous and much revered Democratic doctrine.

"In the name of its Democratic author, James Monroe, I denounce their vaunted advocacy of this truly American doctrine as false and hypocritical. We stand for this doctrine in its essence and form and demand its rigid enforcement.

"Sixth—In order to obtain place and power they pledged themselves, in the interest of an expanding commerce, to construct a water-way to connect the two great oceans. They have repudiated this promise. They have negotiated the Hay-Pauncefote treaty which, while it virtually abrogates the Monroe doctrine, renders it impossible to build an American canal. Under the terms and provisions of this treaty, which is English and not American, the canal can never be constructed. We stand for an American canal, owned, constructed, operated, and fortified by America.


"Seventh—They declared in their platform that their party was responsible for the merit system; that it was their creature; and that the civil service law should be protected and its operation extended.

"Their protection of this law has been such as the wolf gives the babe. They did not dare openly repeal the law nor to modify it by an act of Congress, but they have insidiously by an order from the President, extorted from him to aid them to obtain and hold political power, greatly impaired the efficiency of the law.

"By the President's order many thousand lucrative offices regularly covered by the civil service law were taken from under the protection, and these places turned over to his partisan followers in a vain effort to satisfy their political greed.

"Eighth—They declared in their platform in favor of the admission of the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma as States of the Union, yet, after nearly four years of full power, they are still Territories. Under the wicked rule of law as now applied by the Republican party to some of our Territories they may at an early date find erected between themselves and the balance of the Union a tariff wall which will serve to pauperize them while it enriches others.

"Ninth—When Congress last assembled the President, in his



EXTERIOR OF KANSAS CITY CONVENTION HALL.



DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION HALL, CHICAGO, 1896.

first utterance addressed to the representatives fresh from the people, solemnly urged upon them that it was their 'plain duty' to give free trade to Porto Rico. His party leaders, quick to obey his injunction, made ready to comply with his recommendations. But in a night, almost in the twinkling of an eye, the mighty magnates of the trusts swept down upon Washington and interposed their strong arm, and 'plain duty' vanished like mist before the rising sun.

"The President wheeled into line, the Republican party reversed its policy, and set up a tariff wall between the Island of Porto Rico and the remainder of the United States. It is not at all surprising that in the recent somewhat lengthy declarations of principles enunciated by the party in convention assembled, while they enlarged upon almost every political question, they could not find the space to point with pride to the achievements of their party in its dealings with that unhappy island.

"The Democratic party stands for equal taxation, equal rights, and opportunities to all who come under the folds of the flag.

"Tenth—They wholly failed by their legislation or by the cheaper method of platform declaration to tell the country what their policy is in respect to the Philippine Islands. For two years by their equivocating policy, and no policy at all, they have continued in that archipelago a war, expensive in human blood as well as in money.

"Incompetent to deal with this question and too cowardly to avow their real purpose of imperialism and militarism in dealing with these and kindred colonial questions, they should be retired from power, and the control should be given to a party honest, bold, and patriotic enough to apply American theories and precepts to existing conditions, and thereby solve them in harmony with the underlying principles of the Declaration of Independence and the constitution of our country.

"Eleventh—Another part of the issue of the campaign this year is the scandalous dealings of a high Cabinet officer with private banks of the country. These scandals are notorious and are based upon the earnest and repeated written demands of the officers of some of these banks that they should be favored by this administration because of money contributed by them with which to buy the Presidency of 1896.

"Correspondence submitted to Congress shows that, in one case at least, an appeal from an institution in New York City to the Secretary of the Treasury for financial assistance because, as it was claimed, the officers of that bank had contributed liberally to the election of the present Chief Executive, was not made in vain, and the asked for assistance in this case from the Government was freely if not corruptly given.

"Twelfth—The scandals which surrounded the War department in feeding embalmed beef to the soldiers, in its purchase of old yachts, tugs, ocean liners, ocean tramps, barges, scows, etc., for use as army transports constitute an important chapter.

"Thirteenth—So also the scandals in connection with the post-

office matters in Cuba, and the scandals in connection with the expenditure of the funds of the Paris exposition. Time will not merit an amplification of all these scandals.

"Fourteenth—They loudly proclaim that theirs is the party of liberty, and in their vainglory boast of their name, Republican, yet they are caught coquetting and forming secret entangling alliances of the most detestable character with the old mother monarchy.

"They stand supinely by and refuse even an expression of sympathy with the Boer republics in their heroic and unequal struggle for existence as against the gross oppressions and brutal efforts at enslavement of the same old tyrant who went down in defeat when he sought to prevent the establishment of our own liberty-loving republic.

"They thus permit a brave people, in love with their free republican institutions, to perish from the earth, lest by one word of sympathy and comfort they might offend the delicate sensibilities of their new-found ally, Great Britain.

"Fifteenth—An important chapter is the oft-repeated promise, made to be broken, that when the war ceased the oppressive, burdensome, and vexatious war taxes on many articles of prime necessity should be repealed or reduced.

"Though the war closed two years ago, and notwithstanding there is a large and growing surplus in the Treasury, not one dollar of reduction in these taxes has been made.

"It is known that delegation after delegation of citizens, suffering from these burdens, crowded the committee-rooms at Washington and literally begged for some relief. It is true that those of us who constitute the minority of Congress joined in that appeal and declared our readiness to support any and all measures that might in some degree remove these burdens of taxation. But a deaf ear was turned by the Republicans to all such efforts for relief and none came.

"It is well known also that no relief will be given by the party in power, and it is vain for overburdened people to look to them while present policies are attempted to be enforced.

"The only hope for relief lies in hurling from power the Republican party, and the restoration of the party which believes in simple and economical government.

"Sixteen and lastly—The cost of Republicanism and its twin monster—imperialism.

"This is neither the time nor the occasion to discuss in detail the increased appropriations made necessary by the Republican policy of imperialism.

"Briefly, however, I will mention that the average of appropriations per year for all purposes of government for the two years immediately preceding the Spanish-American war was about \$475,000,000. The average expenditures per annum for each of the three years since that war, including the fiscal year upon which we have just entered, shows an increase of nearly \$300,000,000. The total increase for the three years will be nearly \$900,000,000. And in like proportion it will go on.

"This shows the difference in cost of the empire as against the republic. These figures refer alone to the money cost of the change, and do not include the expense of the blood of the American boys, the price of which is far beyond computation.

"Yes, a man who stands like a mighty rock in the desert; a man who knowing the right will dare do the right; a man who, 'rather than follow a multitude to do evil, will stand like Pompey's pillar, conspicuous by himself, and single in integrity.'

"Such a man, as the one part, this convention will tender to the nation as its candidate for President. A man who is unsurpassed as a citizen, unequaled as an orator, courageous as a soldier, conspicuous in every element that constitutes the typical and the true American—William J. Bryan of Nebraska."

His mention of the name of W. J. Bryan brought the convention to its feet in a frenzy of enthusiasm. Delegates sprang upon their chairs, waving hats, handkerchiefs and umbrellas in the wildest fashion. The usual nonsense of delegates marching around the hall carrying the standards of the States, grouping them together on the floor, elevating them to the galleries and in other ways manifesting the wild sort of idiocy which goes for enthusiasm in National conventions was kept up for half an hour. When order was sufficiently restored Delegate Cannon moved an adjournment until 10:30 a. m. July 5, 1900, which was declared carried.

Chairman Richardson called the convention to order shortly after 11 o'clock, July 5, 1900. Prayer was offered by Rt. Rev. John J. Glennon, of Kansas City. Mr. Richardson then announced that the platform committee was not ready to report, and pending word from them, he invited ex-Governor Hogg, of Texas, to the platform, who made a long speech. At the conclusion of Governor Hogg's address, the cry of "Hill" started, and the chairman pounded his gavel vigorously, and when order was restored, introduced A. M. Dockery, of Missouri. The first mention of Dewey's name since the opening of the convention was made by Mr. Dockery while discussing the Philippine question, but the name of the famous

admiral was received without a ripple of applause. As no word was received from the platform committee, the time of the morning session was given over to speech-making by Mayor D. S. Rose, of Milwaukee; J. E. McCullough, of Indianapolis; Congressman James R. Williams, of Illinois; Gov. J. W. Beckham, of Kentucky, and J. W. Miles, of Maryland. Mr. Williams submitted the following resolution:

"That a committee of nine delegates be appointed by the chair for the purpose of conferring with the Silver Republicans and the Populist parties now gathered in Kansas City."

Shouts of "No!" "No!" followed the reading, but the resolution was put to a vote, and amid much confusion on the floor, was declared adopted. Chairman Richardson announced that he had been informed that the platform committee would be ready to submit their report about 3:30 p. m. Thereupon a motion was put and carried to adjourn until that hour.

When the convention reassembled at 3:30, nearly all of the delegates were ready for business. It was after 4 o'clock when Chairman Richardson called the convention to order. The platform committee, headed by Senator Jones, Judge Van Wyck, D. J. Campau and Senator Tillman, pushed their way to the front and presented their report. The document was read by Senator Tillman, of South Carolina, in a full round voice, easily heard throughout the hall. As he proceeded, each plank was greeted with applause. When the applause subsided, Senator Jones moved that the platform be adopted by acclamation. The motion was put, and amid a roar of cheers and applause, the platform was adopted without a word of dissent.

The plank in the platform denouncing England's policy toward the Boers had called out immense

applause. Then it was announced that Webster Davis, former Assistant Secretary of the Interior under McKinley, would address the convention.

The speech of Mr. Davis was arranged in order to enable him to announce his allegiance to the Democratic party, and the Democratic platform, and to the ticket of the convention.

The chair appointed George Fred Williams, Massachusetts; J. G. Berry, Arkansas; W. H. Thompson, Nebraska; Charles Thomas, Colorado; D. S. Rose, Wisconsin; Thomas H. Martin, Virginia; J. G. McGuire, California; R. R. Tillman, South Carolina, and Carter H. Harrison, Illinois, as members of committee to confer with Silver Republicans and Populists.

Chairman Richardson said:

"The next business before the convention is the nomination of a candidate for the Presidency of the United States. The secretary will call the roll of States."

When Alabama was called, the chairman of the delegation of that State said:

"We yield to Nebraska the privilege of naming the next President of the United States."

Mr. W. D. Oldham, of Nebraska, presented the name of Mr. Bryan to the convention. He spoke as follows:

"Mr. Chairman: More than a hundred years ago the continental congress of America adopted a declaration which had been drafted by the founder of the Democratic party, and the joyous tones of the old liberty bell which greeted the act announced to a waiting world that a nation had been born.

"With hearts unchilled by the selfish sentiments of cold commercialism, you have responded patriotically to each sentiment contained in democracy's first platform as it was read to you at the opening of this convention; and in view of the radical departure which the party in power had made from the principles set forth in that historic document, it is meet that we—true believers in the republic of old—should, when choosing a field and forming our lines for the bloodless battle of ballots now impending, say in the language of one of the loved patriots of long ago: 'Read this declaration at the head of

the army, and every sword shall be drawn from its scabbard, and a solemn vow taken to maintain it or to perish on the bed of honor.'

"Much of the history of this republic shall be either made or marred by the action of this convention. You, as representatives of the only party which is coexistent with the nation itself; the only party which ever had within its own ranks sufficient constructive statesmanship to create a nation in which each citizen becomes a sovereign, have, true to the traditions you bear, in your platform set out in simple language, with a decided American accent, a plan for the people's redemption from each sacrilege and schism taught by the republican party. The plan contains nothing but the approved precepts of the elders and doctors of your faith. If on a platform you place a candidate whose devoted and unblemished life shall stand as a pledge to the plain people that he, in good faith, will carry out the solemn covenants made therein, then the hour of our ultimate triumph is at hand.

"There is no greater honor reserved for a citizen of these United States than to become the standard-bearer of the democratic party. It at once enrolls his name on the scroll of the 'immortals who are not born to die,' and encircles him with a halo of the glory of all the illustrious achievements which that unconquered and unconquerable organization has emblazoned on every page of our nation's history. It intrusts to his keeping the fame of that long line of statesmen and patriots who have knelt for a blessing at democracy's shrine.

"Oh, bright are the names of those heroes and sages,
That shine like stars through the dimness of ages;
Whose deeds are inscribed on the pages of story
Forever to live in the sunlight of glory.'

"This high distinction must not be unworthily bestowed. It must follow as a reward for noble actions bravely done, for unrequited, tireless toil, for sacrifices made and strength displayed, for trusts discharged and pledges kept. We must seek a leader whose public and private life most nearly exemplifies his party's highest ideals; who stands unqualifiedly pledged to every issue we declare; who will carry the standard we place in his hands, even as the Black Douglas carried the sacred casket that inclosed the heart of Bruce.

"He must not declare for free trade with Porto Rico, and then at the persuasive suggestion of the sugar and tobacco trusts sign a bill for a tariff on the products of that island.

"He must not denounce a policy as one of 'criminal aggression,' and then at the demand of a power behind the throne pursue the policy he has so denounced.

"He must not, while professing opposition to combines and conspiracies against trade, send his emissaries to the trust baron castles to beg, like Lazarus at Dives' gates, for subscriptions to his campaign. He must not lend the moral support of his administration to a monarchy in its efforts to destroy a republic. But he must ever sympathize with a people struggling for the right of self-government.

"Instead of the republican policy of monometallism, he must offer the free and unlimited coinage of the money metals of the con-

stitution—the gold that polished the winged sandals of Hermes and the silver that glitters in the bow of Diana.

“Instead of a panic-breeding credit currency, controlled by the bank trust, he must offer government paper controlled by the people.

“He must be able to distinguish between democratic expansion and republican imperialism. The first is a natural growth by the addition of contiguous American territory, into every foot of which is carried the constitution, the flag, and the decalogue, and over the shoulders of every inhabitant of the added territory is thrown a purple robe of sovereign citizenship. It is a growth that has added eighteen stars to the field of blue in the ‘banner of the free’ to symbolize the states that have been carved from territory annexed to the domain of this nation by the wisdom and statesmanship of the democratic party. This is an expansion that is bounded on the north by the constitution of the United States, on the east by the Monroe doctrine, on the south by the declaration of independence, and on the west by the ten commandments.

“How different this from the bandit policy of the republican imperialism, with its standing army and bayonet rule of conquered provinces, its government of sullen subjects against their will by force and fraud; its denial to them of the protection of either the constitution or the command which says, ‘Thou shalt not steal’—a policy that would send our Uncle Sam off his American range with a cowboy hat, a rope and a branding iron, to rustle and brand over all the islands of the orient, while hypocritically chanting the long-meter doxology.

“Democratic skies are tinged with a rosier hue to-day than when we met in convention four years ago. Then a financial cataclysm had spread over the country, and, although its every inducing cause was easily traced to the errors and follies of the Republican party, yet we were in power when it came, and were wrongly held responsible for the wreck of shattered fortunes which followed in its wake. Torn asunder by dissensions within and disasters without, our party faced a gloomy and foreboding future which seemed to augur its dissolution. The problem then was to select a standard-bearer bold enough to cover the rear of a retreat and save the party from destruction, if not from defeat.

“While discord with her flaming torch confused the counsels there, from out the sunset realm a champion came and bade defiance to the oncoming host. With the strength of youth and the wisdom of age, with knightly mien and matchless speech, he towered above his peers, and all who saw him then with one accord did hail him ‘Chief’ and gave our party’s banner to his hand. Slowly despair gave way to hope; confidence took the place where timorous fear had been; the broken, shattered columns formed again, and behind him singing came six million five hundred thousand valiant men to that unequal fight.

“And the story of how well he fought, how fearlessly he fell, and how dearly the enemy’s victory was bought, has all gone out into history now.

“Back from his ‘first battle’ he came, a baffled but unconquered

hero of the rights of men. Conscious of the rectitude of his purpose and cheered by the belief 'that no issue is ever settled until it is settled right,' he cheerfully acquiesced in the result of that campaign and girded his loins for the next great contest between the dollar and the man.

"For four years he has waged an unceasing warfare against the people's enemy. For four years he has held up the party's standard, and his voice has cheered the hosts of democracy in every state and territory. When the trusts began to increase under the protection of a Republican administration he was the first to point out the danger and prescribe a remedy.

"When the alarm of war for humanity roused the heroic spirit of our land he offered his sword to his country's cause on the day that war was declared.

"When later he saw the administration departing from the ancient landmarks of our institutions in its enchanted dream of empire and militarism, he was the first to raise a warning voice, and, resigning his commission on the day the treaty of peace was signed, he threw himself into the contest for the rescue of the republic.

"Realizing that imperialism, like the fabled Artæus, was born of earth, and that contended with upon the selfish, worldly plane of greed and gold, it was of giant strength, and if thrown down would rise again refreshed from contact with its mother element, he, like the mighty Hercules, raised it above the sordid sphere from which its strength was drawn and on a plane of lofty patriotism he strangled it.

"With the issues now clearly drawn no doubt remains as to the name of our candidate. On that question we are a reunited democracy.

"Already worthy allies differing from us rather in name than faith have shouted for our gallant leader again, and every state and territory has instructed its delegates to this convention to vote for him. So it only remains for Nebraska to pronounce the name that has been thundered forth from the foot of Bunker Hill and echoed back from Sierra's sunset slope, and that reverberates among the pine-clad, snow-capped hills of the north and raises up from the slumbering flower-scented savannahs of the south; and that name is the name of William Jennings Bryan, her best-loved son."

When the speaker had concluded, there was a cheer that swept across the convention. It was a simultaneous roar from all parts of the hall. Then the usual march around the hall by the yelling and perspiring delegates bearing aloft their state banners, took place. It took exactly twenty-seven minutes for the convention to get through yelling. When quiet was restored, Chairman Richardson announced that speeches seconding the nom-

ination were now in order. Arkansas yielded to Texas, and Mr. Perkins took the platform and delivered an excellent speech eulogizing the candidate.

His speech was applauded; the clerk commenced to call roll of states, but was drowned out by vociferous cries for "Hill," "Hill." Ex-Senator White, of California, pushed his way to the platform, and his stentorian tones soon demanded attention, and by his decided delivery, the convention was kept in fairly good order. Senator White spoke as follows:

"Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Convention: I arise to second the nomination of the next President of the United States, William Jennings Bryan. I presided over two of the national conventions of my party, and I tell you I have never seen displayed more magnificent, splendid and heartfelt enthusiasm than that which controls this audience to-day. We are in the presence of great national danger. We are at the parting of the ways. The question of the day is republic or empire.

"I am here to advocate Mr. Bryan—first, because he is an honest man; second, because he is a competent man; third, he is a man who loves the constitution and who believes that the constitution follows the flag. He does not credit the modern notion that empire and conquest ever entered into the minds of George Washington or Thomas Jefferson. He does not believe in any theory that would abridge legitimate enterprise or hamper the exercise of individual and conscientious law-abiding judgment. We appeal to you, not with money, not with property, not with promises of empire, not with the alluring glories of oriental triumphs, but we appeal to you as men who wish to transmit unsullied and untarnished to your children that priceless heritage for which men have fought, have bled and have died, and with dying breath have demanded that you and I should defend. There is no man who more thoroughly typifies the thoughts that I have uttered than William Jennings Bryan."

Connecticut yielded for David B. Hill. Even as the state yielded, the convention took up the cry which had been on its tongue for three days. The only delegates who remained in their seats were the Tammany men. Ex-Senator Hill spoke slowly, but clearly, and the attention given him was remarkable. His laudation of Bryan was received with applause and cheers, but when he said,

"Bryan will have the support of a united party," the convention went wild, and the band had to play "America" to still the tumult. Mr. Hill said:

"Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention: In behalf of the Democratic masses of the state of New York, for whom I assume to speak on this occasion, I second the nomination which has been made from the state of Nebraska. William J. Bryan does not belong to Nebraska alone; he belongs to the north and the south, to the east and the west—he belongs to the whole country at large. It is a nomination already made in the hearts and affections of the American people. From the closing of the polls four years ago until this very hour there never was a possibility of any other nomination being made.

"He is a gentleman that needs no introduction to this audience, nor to the American people. Nebraska is proud of him, but New York is proud of him also. For four years he has upheld the banner of democracy in almost every state in this union. His voice has been heard not only in behalf of our principles, but in behalf of the cause of the common people, in behalf of the workingmen, in behalf of humanity. He will not only have the support of his party—a united party—

"He is strong, strong with the masses, strong with the farmers, strong with the artisan—stronger even than his own cause. His integrity has never been questioned during all the time that he has been under the gaze of the American people. His statesmanship has been exhibited in the halls of congress. No others have served during such a brief period, that made such an impression upon the minds and hearts and conscience of the American people. This convention meeting in this most beautiful city, surrounded by this hospitable community, was indeed the proper place to nominate this candidate.

"The cause he represents is peculiarly the cause of the people. His election will mean honesty and integrity in public office. It will mean a return to the advocacy of the principles of the declaration of independence. It will prove a blessing not only to those who vote for him, but to the few who may vote against him. I, as you well know, was one of those who, in good faith, doubted the wisdom of some portions of the platform, doubted the propriety of going into details on certain portion of our financial policy; but the wisdom of this convention has determined otherwise, and I acquiesce cheerfully in the decision.

"I am here to say further that the platform that has been read is worthy of the vote and approval of every man who claims to be a Democrat in this country. Those who do not admire some portions can speak for others. If there are some issues which they do not desire to present as strong as some other, they can at least talk about something in this platform that is worthy of their approval. At least, in some portions of this country the paramount issue is going to carry, and carry strongly.

"This is the time for unity and not for division. I plead for party harmony and for party success. I plead because of the dangers which confront us. If we should happen to be defeated, which I do not believe, what will follow? It means the restoration of a federal election law. It means a reduction of the reapportionment of members of congress throughout the southern states of our union. It means a consequent reduction in the electoral college from our southern states, and the plea of necessity will be made because it will be apparent by election day that some of the new-born states of the west, which they had relied upon, had gone over to the Democratic party.

"This nomination will meet the approval, based upon this platform, of the people of the east. What we need is an old-fashioned rousing Democratic victory throughout this land. That will mean a restoration of the currency of our fathers. That will mean the supremacy of equal laws throughout the country, and in this great result which we hope to achieve, I am here to say simply in conclusion that New York expects to join with you with her thirty-six electoral votes.

Senator John Daniel, of Virginia, was then escorted to the platform, and as he appeared at the front of the desk, he was accorded an enthusiastic reception. When he said, "I second the nomination of one who would rather be right than be president," a perfect storm of cheers swept over the audience. Senator Daniel spoke as follows:

"I have but a few words to say, and shall detain you but a few moments from the most pleasing duty, the crowning event of this wonderful convention. On behalf of the unanimous delegation from Virginia, and by command of the sovereign people of that state, I second the nomination of one who would rather be right than be president. One who is now right by the instinctive virtues of his own ennobling, discerning virtue, and who will soon be president by the manly virtues of the American people.

"The Republican party of this country met not long since in the old, historic city of Philadelphia, rich with the memorials and relics of the grandest intellectual and moral struggle for which heroes ever drew swords. They were there with those memorials before them. They were in the sight and under the shadow of old Independence Hall, but no voice fell from the lips of the Republican party which there sat within its portal that would remind the country of where they were, or that they had any memory of the great struggle that made us free. It was but natural, for they could not have repeated a single sentence from the constitution of the United States with respect to their present conduct—no, they could not have read

the declaration of independence without everybody supposing that a satirist had gotten among them to disturb or break up the meeting.

"I second the nomination of one who is to-day the foremost citizen on the soil of Democratic expansion, and who will become in November next not only the foremost citizen in moral and intellectual grandeur, but the foremost citizen and chief magistrate of a country in which all the people love and confide in him, and in which every man knows that he will receive from him justice without price."

When New Hampshire was called, the chairman of the delegation announced they had intended to cast the vote of the state for David Bennett Hill, but decided to second the nomination of William J. Bryan.

Ex-Governor Robert E. Pattison then ascended the platform and received an ovation. He said:

"Pennsylvania's excuse for detaining you at this hour is because of her enthusiasm in the work of this convention. The voice of the people has already made this nomination. This convention has simply confirmed the sentiments of the people from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Pennsylvania already, and at all times, is upon the firing line in every contest of the democracy. I stand here representing 450,000 Democrats. The sentiments of democracy were first inculcated in the colonial government of Pennsylvania, when its founder declared that colony's capacity for self-government. I am here now seconding the nomination of one who believes, and whose every fiber vibrates with the doctrine of individual liberty and man's capacity for self-government.

"Never before in all the political history of this country was there a more important contest. The people are to determine whether they shall be restored to their own or not, whether this government shall be made a government of the few against the many, and, in seconding the nomination of the honored William Jennings Bryan of Nebraska, we have the utmost hope that a government of the people, by the people and for the people will again be restored."

Gov. Benton McMillan, of Tennessee, stood in his chair instead of walking to the platform for the few words in which he seconded the nomination of Mr. Bryan. Governor McMillan said:

"On behalf of a state that has furnished three great presidents to the United States, I am instructed by the delegation to second the nomination of that man who is the real tribune of the people, who has never cringed before power, who has never pandered to prejudice, who is as brave as Andrew Jackson, who is as eloquent as Cic-

ero, and who is as patriotic as George Washington—William J. Bryan.

A number of other gentlemen spoke for a minute or so, seconding the nomination. A ringing cheer followed the call of "Hawaii," and when John H. Wise, of that delegation, rose in his seat, the convention demanded that he take the platform, which he did amid great applause. Mr. Wise said:

"The delegates of Hawaii have traveled over 4,000 miles to attend this convention (cries of "Hurrah for Hawaii!"). Last night a delegation from Hawaii cast the winning vote for the 16 to 1 issue. We come here to nominate that greatest of Americans, towering head and shoulders over all his countrymen—the man who is brave enough to stand up according to his own principles. That man, gentlemen, is the man we nominate. And, gentlemen, if we were only a state we would do more for that peerless American, William Jennings Bryan."

Mrs. Cohen, of Utah, the only woman delegate to the convention, received a tremendous ovation when she took the platform. She spoke for not over half a minute, and so faintly that her voice could scarcely be heard. She seconded the nomination of Mr. Bryan in behalf of Utah. The speeches concluded, the secretary called the roll of states on the ballot for the presidential nomination. The announcement of Chairman Richardson that Mr. Bryan had been nominated for president of the United States unanimously was received with applause. The chairman then announced the convention adjourned until 10:30 a. m., July 6, 1900.

Chairman Richardson called the convention to order at 10:30 a. m., July 6, 1900. Prayer was offered by Rabbi Mayer, of Kansas City. There was great confusion in the hall, and the call of states for nominations for the vice-presidency was commenced before half the delegates knew what was going on. Alabama, Arkansas and California had been passed when the delegates from

those states demanded recognition. Arkansas yielded to Illinois, and Congressman Williams placed ex-Vice-President Stevenson in nomination, saying:

"Gentlemen of the Convention: Illinois is grateful to Arkansas for this evidence of her regard. The united democracy of Illinois desires to present to this convention for the next vice-president of the United States a Democrat—one who drew his first breath from the pure, democratic atmosphere of old Kentucky; one baptized in the great and growing democracy of Illinois; one who has stood squarely on every democratic platform since he became a voter; one who has twice represented in congress a district overwhelmingly Republican; one who is not a rough rider, but a swift rider; not a warrior, but a statesman; a man who stands for civil government against military rule; a man who believes that a president of the United States who ignores the constitution as the present Republican president has done, must be one who loves his own glory far more than he loves the republic; a man who believes American despotism is no better than any other despotism; a man who places human blood above human greed; a man who will not trade away the precious life of an American soldier for a nugget of gold in the Philippine islands; a man who would not give the 3,000 or 3,500 brave American soldiers whom McKinley has sacrificed in that hot-bed of disease and destruction for all the islands in the sea; a man, who, during four years of faithful administration as first assistant post-master-general of the United States, demonstrated that he knows a Republican when he sees him in an office that belongs to a Democrat.

"Nominate our man and you will not have to explain any speech made against democracy. He is a man in the full strength of his manhood, able to canvass any state in this union.

"Gentlemen of the convention, Illinois makes no exaggeration when she tells you that in that great state the conditions are far better, the prospects are much brighter for democracy than in 1892, when our candidate for vice-president carried it by 30,000 majority. We have a state ticket stronger than we ever had before. We have but one democracy in Illinois.

"We voice the sincere sentiment of the democracy of Illinois when we ask you to nominate a man whose name we will present, a man who has been tried, gone through the contest, and no weak spots found in his armor; a man whose high character and ability recommend him to the people in every part of this republic; a man who possesses all the noble attributes of a nobleman, great enough and good enough to be president of the United States, with a platform that reads like a Bible, and with these two faithful Democrats standing together, shoulder to shoulder, we can sweep criminal aggression and McKinley hypocrisy off the face of the earth.

"Gentlemen of the convention, we now present to you as the choice of the united democracy of our state that distinguished statesman, that splendid, vigorous, reliable Democrat, ex-vice-president Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois."

Great cheering followed this speech. When the call of states reached Connecticut, that state gave way to Minnesota amid cheers and cries for "Towne." When quiet was restored, L. A. Rosing, of Minnesota, took the platform to present the name of Chas. A. Towne, saying :

"Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Convention: It is a great honor to be privileged to answer 'here' to the roll-call of Minnesota. The democracy of the North Star state has a candidate for the nomination for vice-president to submit to the right judgment of this convention. We come to you to present the name of a man worthy of the high honor of being placed upon the same ticket with the splendid champion of equal rights whom you have nominated for president.

"We Democrats of Minnesota feel that we have earned the right to participate actively and effectively in the national councils of the party. For forty years prior to 1898 the party had wandered in the wilderness, but as a result of the great contest of 1896 and because of the splendid accessions to our ranks in that campaign, we entered the battle of 1898 more aggressively than ever before, and at last realized in our own state that for which we had striven so long and elected a democratic governor.

"The voters of those campaigns now stand shoulder to shoulder, determined that this year the electoral vote of Minnesota shall be cast for the nominees of this convention. This condition was made possible because of the brilliancy, courage and fidelity to principle of the men who in that memorable campaign patriotically put country above party and severed their relationship with the Republican party, casting aside personal ambition, prejudices and self-interest.

"The man of this type who perhaps sacrificed more than any one else, who more than any other was called to lay upon the sacrificial altar a brilliant future, filled with promise enough to satisfy the vaulting ambition, who had the courage to sever the ties of personal friendship that he might be true to his ideas of Americanism, is the man whom Minnesota to-day proposes to this convention as its candidate for vice-president. We come to you asking for your support for our candidate, not because he is from Minnesota, but because he is of the people; not because he is a product of the north-west, but because he is an American; not because he stands for any one issue, but for all the issues that mean the preservation of American institutions.

"We ask your support of him, because he is a Democrat of Jeffersonian principle, a Democrat of the stern school of Andrew Jackson, a Democrat of the broad philosophy and humanity of Abraham Lincoln, a Democrat in defending the flag of the union and in believing that to whatever land that flag be carried there the people over whom it floats are under the constitution.

"We present him to you not because he is rich in this world's

goods, not because his nomination would mean contributions, but because a beneficent God has endowed him with an eloquent tongue, a brilliant mind, a splendid courage, a big heart, and all the qualities of American manhood.

"We ask your support for Minnesota's able statesman, orator, and patriot, whom I have the honor to place in formal nomination as the unanimous choice of the Minnesota democracy, a leader of the people, Charles A. Towne."

There was cheering from the Minnesota delegation and from the galleries, but it was noted there was little enthusiasm among the men on the floor who had the votes. At this point in the proceedings an effort was made to get ex-Senator David B. Hill, of New York, to take the nomination, and the confusion in the hall was of such magnitude that no business could be transacted. Even after Chairman Richardson had recognized Governor Thomas, of Colorado, to second the nomination of Mr. Towne, not a word of his speech could be heard. Governor Thomas said:

"I am here to lift my voice on behalf of a man who stands to the full measure of our splendid candidate for president, whose voice will be heard on every stump, whose influence is almost as extensive as that of our splendid leader, and who has signified his devotion to the great cause of modern democracy by his enthusiastic support of its principles and its candidates ever since the great Chicago platform of 1896.

"Upon this platform the great senator from New York (Hill) called our attention to the necessity of unity and harmony as the essentials of this campaign. My friends, if there ever was a time when unity and harmony were absolutely essential, the day and the hour have arrived, and every man and every woman whose heart beats in unison with the platform should be brought into line for the support of that platform and its candidates.

"If devotion to democratic principles is of any significance, if devotion to candidates and principles by day and by night, at all times and under all circumstances constitutes democracy, then is Charles A. Towne of Minnesota, a Democrat.

"I recall the fact that four years ago it was his great speech on the floor of the house of representatives of congress that became a household document and a household word to 70,000,000 of American people. I remember that, wherever the battle was thickest and the fight was fiercest, there stood this gallant son of Minnesota, firmly by the right, speaking and working on behalf of William J. Bryan and the Chicago platform.



NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE.



SCENE AT DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION ON JULY 5, 1900, DURING THE READING OF THE PLATFORM.

"My friends, I do not care so far as I am individually concerned about the man, be he Jew or Gentile, black or white, native or foreign born, Republican or Democrat; if he believes in the great underlying principles of democracy he is one of us and cannot be against us.

"What Ney was to Napoleon, what Melancthon was to Luther, what Ireton was to Cromwell, what Sherman was to Grant, that is Charles A. Towne, of Minnesota, to William J. Bryan, of Nebraska.

"It is said that geographical conditions should be considered. This great statesman belongs to no locality. He is ready to deliver his challenge and throw his glove at the feet of the so-called hero of San Juan and defy him to political combat through the length and breadth of this country.

"It is as far from New England to Duluth as it is from Kentucky to New York, and as far as the candidate himself is concerned he has every equipment, independent of geographical conditions, to place him side by side upon this platform with our great nominee.

"I present and second the nomination of Charles A. Towne."

When Delaware was called, the announcement was made that the state yielded to New York. Delegate Grady, one of the leaders of Tammany Hall, had already ascended the platform, and as he stepped to the front to address the convention, the applause was deafening.

"On behalf of the democracy of New York," he said, "I present to this convention for the nomination for the vice-presidency the name of David Bennett Hill." The effect was electrical. His words set the convention in a frenzy of enthusiasm. Mr. Hill worked his way to the platform and asked Mr. Grady to yield to him that he might make a statement, but Grady declined. All of the New York men who knifed Hill when he was a candidate for the resolution committee now began to urge him not to decline the nomination, but Hill only shook his head. Mr. Grady spoke as follows:

"Mr. Chairman: On behalf of the united democracy of the state of New York, I present to this convention as a candidate for vice-president the name of David Bennett Hill.

"The representatives of the democratic party of New York state recognize their responsibility to the democracy of the nation, and believe they appreciate the expectation of the democracy of the union in the presentation of this honored name.

"There is no state in the union with so much to win through

democratic success and so much to lose by republican triumph as the state of New York. We are to elect this year not only the entire state ticket from governor to state engineer; not only, as in every other state of the union, every member of congress, but every member of our state senate and every member of the assembly.

"Desirous of strengthening our hands at home, we desire more to strengthen the national ticket. And we stand here, seventy-two as one to pledge you the electoral vote of the state of New York if David Bennett Hill shall be the nominee of this convention for vice-president.

"This is no idle statement. We believe that David Bennett Hill, by the side of W. J. Bryan and standing upon this platform, is by thousands and thousands of votes the strongest man that can be named to the democracy of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut.

"He is not, nor has he been in any sense a candidate for the nomination. He has suggested every and any means which he thought might bring about harmonious action upon the part of the delegation from the state of New York and secure the electoral vote of the state for our nominees.

"He may be prepared to decline the nomination which the delegates have offered to him, but we say to you, decline or not decline, from the first to the last ballot in this convention New York's seventy-two united, enthusiastic, true blood democratic votes will be cast for David B. Hill."

During all this time Mr. Hill kept repeating, "I will not take it." To Senator Grady he said, "This is absolutely unfair. You should not do it."

The New York delegation again urged Mr. Hill not to decline, but he was obdurate. Finally, he called upon Senator Jones and asked his help to prevent the nomination being forced upon him. This Jones agreed to do. Mr. Hill advanced to the front and said:

"Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention: While I greatly appreciate the action of the delegation from New York, it is proper for me to say that it is without my approval. I appreciate also the manifestations of friendliness on the part of the delegates from other states, but I feel that it is my duty to rise here and now and say to you that, for personal reasons, and good and valid reasons, I cannot accept this nomination.

"I have not been a candidate, I do not desire to be a candidate, and I must not be nominated by this convention.

"There are gentlemen here whose names have been or will be presented to this convention, any one of which names is stronger than my own. There is no difficulty whatever in making a satisfactory choice, and I ought not in justice to them permit my name to

be used a single moment further, and this convention should proceed to nominate a candidate from some of those who have been named.

"In justice to me, in justice to them, in justice to the party, in justice to the ordinary procedure of this convention, it is unfair to me to place me in this position without my consent."

As Mr. Hill left the platform, he was cheered to the echo. When Georgia was called, Mr. Hutchinson, of that state, seconded the nomination of Stevenson, as did James Kennedy, of Connecticut. Idaho gave way to Washington, and W. H. Dunphy placed in nomination Hon. James Hamilton Lewis, of Washington.

Indiana gave way to Virginia, and Congressman William A. Jones seconded the nomination of Stevenson. Iowa seconded the nomination of Stevenson from the floor, Chairman Sells of that delegation contenting himself with the simple announcement.

Delegate A. Leo Knott, of Maryland, formerly assistant postmaster-general, presented the name of Governor John Walter Smith, of Maryland. When Massachusetts was called, George Fred Williams took the platform, and in a ringing speech, seconded the nomination of Charles A. Towne. Speeches seconding the nomination of Stevenson were made by Senator Money, of Mississippi; ex-Governor Stone, of Missouri; W. H. Sowden, of Pennsylvania; Jonathan Lane, of Texas; J. W. St. Clair, of West Virginia; Mayor Rose, of Milwaukee, and others. At this juncture Ohio put in nomination the name of Hon. A. W. Patrick, of the Buckeye state. His name was presented by M. A. Daugherty. Notwithstanding the speech of Mr. Hill, of New York, positively declining the nomination for the vice-presidency, a number of speeches were made seconding his name. Delegate Daly, of New Jersey, made a long speech in favor of the

"Sage of Wolfred Roost," as did delegates from North Dakota, Tennessee and Hawaii.

S. M. Gates, of North Carolina, presented the name of Col. Julian Carr from his state.

In the meanwhile the convention became impatient over the long list of seconding speeches and the endless flow of oratory, and frequent calls of "time" had the effect of cutting short a great many of the speeches. "Vote, vote," came from all parts of the hall, and after Wisconsin from the floor had seconded Stevenson, the secretary was directed to call the roll of states on the first ballot. Before this was done, J. Hamilton Lewis, of Washington, got up and announced his withdrawal from the race. His was the last speech before the roll-call, and he was loudly cheered.

The start did not bear out the claims of the Stevenson men that the south would be solid for the Illinois man, for Alabama only gave him three out of its twenty-two votes. Hill received the remainder, and his followers in New York and New Jersey shouted their approval. The first loud cheering came when Illinois cast forty-eight votes for her favorite son. From then on there was a steady flow of announcements for the Illinois man. Indiana, except two that were for Towne; Iowa, Kansas, and all but two from Maine, trooped along for Stevenson, with only an interruption when Louisiana cast her sixteen for Hill.

Maryland cast sixteen votes for J. Walter Smith, and then Massachusetts came forward with something all around. Hill got thirteen, Towne six, and Stevenson six. Minnesota cast her full eighteen votes for Towne. This was offset by Mississippi, casting an equal number of votes for Stevenson.

Missouri had a divided vote, of which Stevenson

received the heavy end, twenty-three; Hill, six; Towne, three; Danforth, one; Governor Hogg, of Texas, one. This division of votes was immediately dubbed "The Missouri Compromise." New Jersey cast twenty votes for Hill, followed immediately by the Empire state with seventy-two more. There was a demonstration at these announcements.

Then came a long list of states that added heavily to the Stevenson column. Pennsylvania cast sixty-four for the Illinois man. Tennessee, which went solid for Hill, was the only break in the Stevenson list that included Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, Virginia. Washington left Lewis to go for Towne, then along came the Stevenson troopers again with West Virginia, Wisconsin (except three for Towne), Wyoming, Alaska, and five out of Arizona's six; Hawaii closed the list by casting six votes for Hill.

When the roll-call was completed, a mad rush took place for the Stevenson band wagon. Tennessee led off by shifting her twenty votes from Hill to Stevenson. Alabama and Washington made changes, and then New York came into the fold. The last change was a signal for a tearing up of the state standards all over the hall. Led by Illinois, the state insignia was borne to the front, and a parade started around the hall. There was little cheering, the attention of the delegates being centered on the efforts of the few remaining states to be recorded as unanimously for Stevenson.

The vote of the three leading candidates before any changes were made were as follows: Stevenson, 559½; Hill, 200; Towne, 122½.

However, amid much confusion, every delegate was in line for Stevenson when the chairman announced the result as a unanimous vote. The usual formal resolution

of thanks to Kansas City and to the officers of the convention were adopted amid the greatest confusion, and at 3:21 p. m., July 6, the National Democratic Convention of 1900 adjourned without date.

CHAPTER II.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM FOR 1900.

The following is the full text of the platform adopted at the Democratic National Convention at Kansas City, Mo., July 5, 1900:

We, the representatives of the Democratic party of the United States, assembled in national convention on the anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, do reaffirm our faith in that immortal proclamation of the inalienable rights of man, and our allegiance to the constitution framed in harmony therewith by the fathers of the republic. We hold with the United States Supreme Court that the Declaration of Independence is the spirit of our government, of which the constitution is the form and letter.

We declare again that all governments instituted among men derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; that any government not based upon the consent of the governed is a tyranny; and that to impose upon any people a government of force is to substitute the methods of imperialism for those of a republic.

We hold that the constitution follows the flag, and denounce the doctrine that an Executive or Congress, deriving their existence and their powers from the constitution, can exercise lawful authority beyond it or in violation of it.

We assert that no nation can long endure half republic and half empire, and we warn the American people that imperialism abroad will lead quickly and inevitably to despotism at home.

Believing in these fundamental principles, we denounce the Porto Rico law, enacted by a Republican Congress against the protest and opposition of the Democratic minority, as a bold and open violation of the nation's organic law and a flagrant breach of the national good faith. It imposes upon the people of Porto Rico a government without their consent and taxation without representation.

It dishonors the American people by repudiating a solemn pledge made in their behalf by the commanding General of our army, which the Porto Ricans welcomed to a peaceful and unresisted occupation of their land. It doomed to poverty and distress a people whose helplessness appeals with peculiar force to our justice and magnanimity.

In this, the first act of its imperialistic program, the Republican

party seeks to commit the United States to a colonial policy inconsistent with Republican institutions and condemned by the Supreme Court in numerous decisions.

We demand the prompt and honest fulfillment of our pledge to the Cuban people and the world that the United States has no disposition nor intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over the Island of Cuba, except for its pacification. The war ended nearly two years ago, profound peace reigns over all the island, and still the administration keeps the government of the island from its people while Republican carpet bag officials plunder its revenues and exploit the colonial theory to the disgrace of the American people.

We condemn and denounce the Philippine policy of the present administration. It has involved the republic in unnecessary war, sacrificed the lives of many of our noblest sons, and placed the United States, previously known and applauded throughout the world as the champion of freedom, in the false and un-American position of crushing with military force the efforts of our former allies to achieve liberty and self-government.

The Filipinos cannot be citizens without endangering our civilization; they cannot be subjects without imperiling our form of government, and as we are not willing to surrender our civilization or to convert the republic into an empire, we favor an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to give to the Filipinos, first, a stable government; second, independence, and, third, protection from outside interference, such as has been given for nearly a century to the republics of Central and South America.

The greedy commercialism which dictated the Philippine policy of the Republican administration attempts to justify it with the plea that it will pay, but even this sordid and unworthy plea fails when brought to the test of facts. The war of criminal aggression against the Filipinos, entailing an annual expense of many millions, has already cost more than any possible profit that could accrue from the entire Philippine trade for years to come.

Furthermore, when trade is extended at the expense of liberty, the price is always too high.

We are not opposed to territorial expansion when it takes in desirable territory which can be erected into States in the Union and whose people are willing and fit to become American citizens. We favor trade expansion by every peaceful and legitimate means. But we are unalterably opposed to the seizing or purchasing of distant islands to be governed outside the constitution and whose people can never become citizens.

We are in favor of extending the republic's influence among the nations, but believe that influence should be extended, not by force and violence, but through the persuasive power of a high and honorable example.

The importance of other questions now pending before the American people is in no wise diminished, and the Democratic party takes no backward step from its position on them, but the burning issue of imperialism growing out of the Spanish war in-

volves the very existence of the republic and the destruction of our free institutions. We regard it as the paramount issue of the campaign.

The declaration in the Republican platform adopted at the Philadelphia convention held in June, 1900, that the Republican party "steadfastly adheres to the policy announced in the Monroe doctrine" is manifestly insincere and deceptive. This profession is contradicted by the avowed policy of that party in opposition to the spirit of the Monroe doctrine to acquire and hold sovereignty over large areas of territory and large numbers of people in the eastern hemisphere.

We insist on the strict maintenance of the Monroe doctrine and in all its integrity, both in letter and in spirit, as necessary to prevent the extension of European authority on this continent, and as essential to our supremacy in American affairs. At the same time we declare that no American people shall ever be held by force in unwilling subjection to European authority.

We oppose militarism. It means conquest abroad and intimidation and oppression at home. It means the strong arm which has ever been fatal to free institutions. It is what millions of our citizens have fled from in Europe. It will impose upon our peace-loving people a large standing army and unnecessary burden of taxation and a constant menace to their liberties. A small standing army and a well disciplined State militia are amply sufficient in time of peace.

This republic has no place for a vast military service and conscription. When the nation is in danger the volunteer soldier is his country's best defender.

The National Guard of the United States should ever be cherished in the patriotic hearts of a free people. Such organizations are ever an element of strength and safety. For the first time in our history and coevil with the Philippine conquest has there been a wholesale departure from our time-honored and approved system of volunteer organization. We denounce it as un-American, un-Democratic, and un-Republican, and as a subversion of the ancient and fixed principles of a free people.

Private monopolies are indefensible and intolerable. They destroy competition, control the price of all material, and of the finished product, thus robbing both producer and consumer. They lessen the employment of labor, and arbitrarily fix the terms and conditions thereof, and deprive individual energy and small capital of their opportunity for betterment.

They are the most efficient means yet devised for appropriating the fruits of industry to the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and unless their insatiate greed is checked all wealth will be aggregated in a few hands and the republic destroyed.

The dishonest paltering with the trust evil by the Republican party in State and national platforms is conclusive proof of the truth of the charge that trusts are the legitimate product of Republican policies; that they are fostered by Republican laws, and that they are protected by the Republican administration in return for campaign subscriptions and political support.

We pledge the Democratic party to an unceasing warfare in nation, State, and city against private monopoly in every form. Existing laws against trusts must be enforced, and more stringent ones must be exacted providing for publicity as to the affairs of corporations engaged in interstate commerce, and requiring all corporations to show before doing business outside of the State of their origin that they have no water in their stock, and that they have not attempted and are not attempting to monopolize any branch of business or the production of any articles of merchandise, and the whole constitutional power of Congress over interstate commerce, the mails and all modes of interstate communication shall be exercised by the enactment of comprehensive laws upon the subject of trusts.

Tariff laws should be amended by putting the products of trusts upon the free list to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection.

The failure of the present Republican administration, with an absolute control over all branches of the national government, to enact any legislation designed to prevent or even curtail the absorbing power of trusts and illegal combinations, or to enforce the anti-trust laws already on the statute books prove the insincerity of the high-sounding phrases of the Republican platform.

Corporations should be protected in all their rights and their legitimate interests should be respected, but any attempt by corporations to interfere with the public affairs of the people or to control the sovereignty which creates them should be forbidden under such penalties as will make such attempts impossible.

We condemn the Dingley tariff law as a trust-breeding measure skillfully devised to give the few favors which they do not deserve and to place upon the many burdens which they should not bear.

We favor such an enlargement of the scope of the interstate commerce law as will enable the commission to protect individuals and communities from discriminations, and the public from unjust and unfair transportation rates.

We reaffirm and indorse the principles of the National Democratic Platform adopted at Chicago in 1896, and we reiterate the demand of that platform for an American financial system made by the American people for themselves, which shall restore and maintain a bimetallic price level, and as part of such system the immediate restoration of the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation.

We denounce the currency bill enacted at the last session of Congress as a step forward in the Republican policy which aims to discredit the sovereign right of the national government to issue all money, whether coin or paper, and to bestow upon national banks the power to issue and control the volume of paper money for their own benefit. A permanent national bank currency, secured by government bonds, must have a permanent debt to rest upon, and if the bank currency is to increase with population and business the debt must also increase. The Republican currency scheme is therefore a scheme for fastening upon the taxpayers a perpetual and growing

debt for the benefit of the banks. We are opposed to this private corporation paper circulated as money, but without legal tender qualities, and demand the retirement of the national bank notes as fast as government paper or silver certificates can be substituted for them.

We favor an amendment to the federal constitution providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, and we favor direct legislation wherever practicable.

We are opposed to government by injunction; we denounce the blacklist and favor arbitration as a means of settling disputes between corporations and their employes.

In the interest of American labor and the uplifting of the workmen, as the corner-stone of the prosperity of our country, we recommend that Congress create a Department of Labor, in charge of a Secretary, with a seat in the Cabinet, believing that the elevation of the American laborer will bring with it increased production and increased prosperity to our country at home and to our commerce abroad.

We are proud of the courage and fidelity of the American soldiers and sailors in all our wars; we favor liberal pensions to them and their dependants, and we reiterate the position taken in the Chicago platform in 1896 that the fact of enlistment and service shall be deemed conclusive evidence against disease and disability before enlistment.

We favor the immediate construction, ownership, and operation of the Nicaragua Canal by the United States, and we denounce the insincerity of the plank in the National Republican platform for an isthmian canal in face of the failure of the Republican majority to pass the bill pending in Congress. We condemn the Hay-Pauncefote treaty as a surrender of American rights and interests not to be tolerated by the American people.

We denounce the failure of the Republican party to carry out its pledges, to grant Statehood to the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, and we promise the people of those Territories immediate Statehood and home rule during their condition as Territories, and we favor home rule and a Territorial form of government for Alaska and Porto Rico.

We favor an intelligent system of improving the arid lands of the West, storing the waters for purposes of irrigation, and the holding of such lands for actual settlers.

We favor the continuance and strict enforcement of the Chinese exclusion law and its application to the same classes of all Asiatic races.

Jefferson said: "Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none." We approve this wholesome doctrine and earnestly protest against the Republican departure which has involved us in so-called politics, including the diplomacy of Europe and the intrigue and land-grabbing of Asia, and we especially condemn the ill-concealed Republican alliance with England which must mean discrimination against other friendly nations

and which has already stifled the nation's voice while liberty is being strangled in Africa.

Believing in the principles of self-government, and rejecting, as did our forefathers, the aim of monarchy, we view with indignation the purpose of England to overwhelm with force the south African republics. Speaking, as we do, for the entire American nation, except its Republican office-holders, and for all free men everywhere, we extend our sympathies to the heroic burghers in their unequal struggle to maintain their liberty and independence.

We denounce the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high, and which threaten the perpetuation of the oppressive war levies.

We oppose the accumulation of a surplus to be squandered in such barefaced frauds upon the taxpayers as the shipping subsidy bill, which, under the false pretense of prospering American ship-building, would put unearned millions into the pockets of favorite contributors to the Republican campaign fund.

We favor the reduction and speedy repeal of the war taxes, and a return to the time-honored Democratic policy of strict economy in governmental expenditures.

Believing that our most cherished institutions are in great peril, the very existence of our constitutional republic is at stake, and that the decision now to be rendered will determine whether or not our children are to enjoy those blessed privileges of free government which have made the United States great, prosperous, and honored, we earnestly ask for the foregoing declaration of principles the hearty support of the liberty-loving American people, regardless of previous party affiliations.

CHAPTER III.

*BIOGRAPHY OF HON. WILLIAM J. BRYAN.

ANCESTRY.

Within the last few years Mr. Bryan has corresponded with a number of persons bearing the family name. Some of the Bryans trace their ancestry to Ireland, some to Wales, while others have followed the name through Irish into English history. A biographical sketch written under the supervision of Silas L. Bryan states that the family is of Irish extraction.

William Bryan, who lived in Culpeper County, Virginia, something more than one hundred years ago, is the first ancestor whose name is known to the descendants. Where he was born, and when, is a matter of conjecture. He owned a large tract of land among the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains, near Sperryville. The family name of his wife is unknown. There were born to the pair five children: James, who removed to Kentucky; John, who remained upon the homestead; Aquilla, who removed to Ohio; and Francis and Elizabeth, about whom nothing is known.

John Bryan, the second son, was born about 1799, and at an early age married Nancy Lillard. The Lillard family is an old American family of English extraction, and is now represented by numerous descendants scattered over Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee. To John Bryan and wife ten children were born, all of whom, excepting Russell and Eliz-

*Written by Mrs. Bryan for the "First Battle."

abeth, are deceased. The oldest, William, removed to Missouri in early life and lived near Troy until his death, some ten years ago. John and Howard died in infancy. Jane married Joseph Cheney and lived at Gallipolis, Ohio. Nancy married George Baltzell, and lived in Marion County, Illinois. Martha married Homer Smith, and lived at Gallipolis, Ohio, later removing to Marion County, Illinois. The next child, Robert, a physician, was killed in a steamboat explosion while yet a young man. Silas Lillard, father of William Jennings Bryan, was born November 4th, 1822, near Sperryville, in what was then Culpeper, but now a part of Rappahannock County, Virginia. The next child, Russell, located at Salem, Illinois, where he has since lived. Elizabeth, the youngest of the family, married another George Baltzell. She early removed to Lewis County, Missouri, her present home.

About the year 1828 John Bryan removed with his family to the western portion of Virginia, in what is now West Virginia. His last residence was near Point Pleasant, where both he and his wife died, the latter in 1834, the former in 1836.

Silas, then but a boy, went West and made his home a part of the time with his sister, Nancy Baltzell, and a part of the time with his brother, William. He was ambitious to obtain an education, and after making his way through the public schools, entered McKendree College, at Lebanon, Illinois, where he completed his course, graduating with honors in 1849. Owing to lack of means he was occasionally compelled to drop out of college for a time and earn enough to continue his studies. At first he spent these vacations working as a farm hand, but later, when sufficiently advanced in his

studies, taught school. After graduation he studied law, was admitted to the bar, and began the practice at Salem, Illinois, at the age of twenty-nine. On November 4th, 1852, he married Mariah Elizabeth Jennings. During the same year he was elected to the State Senate and served in that body for eight years. In 1860 he was elected to the circuit bench, and served twelve years. In 1872 he was nominated for Congress upon the Democratic ticket, receiving the endorsement of the Greenback party. He was defeated by a plurality of 240 by General James Martin, Republican candidate. As a member of the convention of 1872, which framed the present Constitution of Illinois, he introduced a resolution declaring it to be the sense of the convention that all offices, legislative, executive and judicial, provided for by the new Constitution, should be filled by elections by the people. Before his election to the bench, and after his retirement therefrom, he practiced law in Marion and the adjoining counties. He was a member of the Baptist Church, the church to which his parents belonged, and was a very devout man. He prayed at morning, noon and night, and was a firm believer in providential direction in the affairs of life. He was a man of strong character, stern integrity and high purpose. He took rank among the best lawyers in Southern Illinois, and was a fluent, graceful and forcible speaker. His mind was philosophical and his speeches argumentative. In politics he was a Democrat in the broadest sense of the word and had an abiding faith in republican institutions and in the capacity of the people for self-government. He was a staunch defender of higher education and gave financial as well as moral support to


various institutions of learning. He regarded the science of government as highly honorable and used to say that the guest chamber of his home was reserved for "politicians and divines." He was broad and tolerant in his religious views. It was his custom, after he removed to the farm, to send a load of hay at harvest time to each preacher and priest in Salem. While a public man during a large part of his life, he was eminently domestic. He died March 30, 1880, and was buried in the cemetery at Salem. His will provided that all of his children should be encouraged to secure "the highest education which the generation affords."

THE JENNINGS FAMILY.

The Jennings family has lived so long in America that the descendants do not know the date of the immigration of the ancestors to the colonies nor is it known positively from what country they came, but they are believed to have been English.

Israel Jennings, who was born about 1774, is the first known ancestor. He was married to Mary Waters about the year 1799, and lived in Mason County, Kentucky. In 1818 he moved with his family to Walnut Hill, Marion County, Illinois, where his wife died in 1844 and he in 1860. He was the father of eight children: Israel Jr., and George, now deceased; Charles Waters, of whom I shall speak later; William W., now living in Texas; Elizabeth, who married William Davidson; America, who married George Davidson; Mary, who married Edward White; and Ann, who married Rufus McElwain. All of the daughters are deceased.

Charles Waters Jennings was married to Maria Woods Davidson, December 14th, 1826, and estab-



THE BRYAN FAMILY ON THE DAY OF THE NOMINATION.



THE LIBRARY IN THE LINCOLN HOME.

lished a home adjoining the Israel Jennings homestead. He died in 1872, and his wife in 1885. To this pair were born eight sons and two daughters: Josephus Waters, deceased, who lived near the home of his father; Harriet, who married B. F. Marshall, and lives at Salem, Illinois; Sarah, who married Robert D. Noleman, of Centralia, Illinois, both deceased; Mariah Elizabeth, the mother of William Jennings Bryan; America, deceased, who married William C. Stites, then of Marion County, Illinois; Nancy, who married Dr. James A. Davenport and lives at Salem, Illinois; Docia, who married A. Van Antwerp, and lives at Sedalia, Missouri; and Zadock, who lives near Walnut Hill.

Mariah Elizabeth Jennings was born near Walnut Hill, Illinois, May 24th, 1834. She attended the public schools of the neighborhood, and when nearly grown was the pupil of Silas L. Bryan, who was nearly twelve years her senior. At an early age she connected herself with the Methodist Episcopal Church, which was the church of her parents, and remained a member until about 1877, when she united with the Baptist Church, at Salem, to which her husband belonged. She was a woman of excellent sense and superior management. Her husband's frequent absence from home threw upon her a large portion of the responsibility of the care and discipline of the family, and for some years after his death her entire time was given to the nurture and education of the five minor children. When the boys were grown she removed from the farm to Salem, and became an active worker in her church and in societies for social improvement. She always took a deep interest in the political fortunes of her son William, and he has always felt indebted

to her equally with his father for counsel and instruction. She lived during the later years of her life in a home which William bought for her use with the first savings from his Congressional salary. After a lingering illness, which she bore with great patience, she died on the 27th of June, 1896, and was laid to rest by the side of her husband.

To Silas Lillard and Mariah Elizabeth Bryan were born nine children. Of these Virginia, John and Hiram died in infancy. Russell Jones, born June 12th, 1864, died at the age of 17, on the eve of his departure for college. Five children are now living, namely:

Francis Mariah, born March 18th, 1858.

William Jennings, born March 19th, 1860.

Charles Wayland, born February 10th, 1867.

Nancy Lillard, born November 4th, 1869.

Mary Elizabeth, born May 14th, 1872.

Francis M. Bryan (now Baird), lives at Salem, Illinois, and Charles W., in Lincoln, Nebraska.

The Bryan, Lillard, Jennings and Davidson families all belonged to the middle classes. They were industrious, law-abiding, God-fearing people. No member of the family ever became very rich, and none were ever abjectly poor. Farming has been the occupation of the majority, while others have followed the legal and medical professions and mercantile pursuits.

BOYHOOD.

William Jennings Bryan was born in Salem, Illinois, March 19th, 1860. He was sturdy, round-limbed and fond of play. There is a tradition that his appetite, which has since been a constant companion, developed very early. The pockets of his

first trousers were always filled with bread, which he kept for an emergency. One of the memories belonging to this period was his ambition to be a minister, but this soon gave place to determination to become a lawyer "like father." This purpose was a lasting one, and his education was directed toward that end.

His father purchased a farm of five hundred acres, one mile from the village, and when William was six years old the family removed to their new home. Here he studied, worked and played, until ten years of age, his mother being his teacher. He learned to read quite early; after committing his lessons to memory, he stood upon a little table and spoke them to his mother. This was his first recorded effort at speech-making. His work was feeding the deer, which his father kept in a small park, helping care for the pigs and chickens, in short the variety of work known as "doing chores." His favorite sport was rabbit hunting with dogs. I am not sure that these expeditions were harmful to the game, but they have furnished his only fund of adventure for the amusement of our children.

At the age of ten, William entered the public school at Salem, and during his five years' attendance, was not an especially brilliant pupil, though he never failed in an examination. In connection with his school, he developed an interest in the work of literary and debating societies.

His father's Congressional campaign in 1872 was his first political awakening, and from that time on he always cherished the thought of entering public life. His idea was to first win a reputation and secure a competency at the bar, but he seized the unexpected opportunity which came to him in 1890.

At fourteen he became a member of the Cumberland Presbyterian church. Later, he joined the First Presbyterian church at Jacksonville, Illinois, and, upon our removal to Nebraska, brought his letter to the First Presbyterian church of Lincoln, to which he still belongs. It may not be amiss at this point to quote from an eulogy which Mr. Bryan delivered upon a colleague in the Fifty-third Congress. This extract will serve a double purpose, in that it gives his views upon immortality, and, at the same time, presents a passage which I think may without impropriety be called a finished bit of English.

I shall not believe that even now his light is extinguished. If the Father deigns to touch with divine power the cold and pulseless heart of the buried acorn, and make it burst forth from its prison walls, will He leave neglected in the earth the soul of man, who was made in the image of his Creator? If He stoops to give to the rosebush, whose withered blossoms float upon the breeze, the sweet assurance of another spring-time, will He withhold the words of hope from the sons of men when the frosts of winter come? If Matter, mute and inanimate, though changed by the forces of Nature into a multitude of forms, can never die, will the imperial spirit of man suffer annihilation after it has paid a brief visit, like a royal guest, to this tenement of clay?

Rather let us believe that He who, in His apparent prodigality, wastes not the raindrop, the blade of grass, or the evening's sighing zephyr, but makes them all to carry out His eternal plans, has given immortality to the mortal, and gathered to Himself the generous spirit of our friend.

Instead of mourning, let us look up and address him in the words of the poet:

"Thy day has come, not gone;
Thy sun has risen, not set;
Thy life is now beyond
The reach of death or change,
Not ended—but begun.
O noble soul! O gentle heart! Hail, and farewell."

COLLEGE LIFE.

At fifteen he entered Whipple Academy, the preparatory department of Illinois College, at Jacksonville, Illinois, and with this step a changed life

began. Vacations found him home, but for eight years he led the life of a student, and then took up the work of his profession. Six years of his school life were spent in Jacksonville, in the home of Dr. Hiram K. Jones, a relative. The atmosphere of this home had its influence upon the growing lad. Dr. Jones is a man of strong character, of scholarly tastes, and of high ideals, and during the existence of the Concord school was a lecturer upon Platonic Philosophy. His wife, too, was a woman of rare attainments, and having no children, they gave the youth a home in the fullest sense of that word.

His parents wished him to take a classical course and while sometimes grumbling over his Latin and Greek, he has since recognized the wisdom of their choice. Of these two languages, Latin was his favorite. He had a strong preference for mathematics, and especially for geometry, and has believed that the mental discipline acquired in this study has since been useful in argument. He was, too, an earnest student of political economy. This entrance into college life brings to mind an incident which shows both the young man's rapid growth and his father's practical views. During the first year of his absence, he discovered, as holidays drew near, that his trousers were becoming too short, and wrote home for money to buy a new pair. His father responded that as it was so near vacation he need not make any purchase until he reached home, and added: "My son, you may as well learn now, that people will measure you by the length of your head, rather than by the length of your breeches."

As to college athletics, he played very little at baseball or at football, but was fond of foot-racing

and of jumping. Three years after graduation on Osage Orange Day, he won a medal for the broad or standing jump, in a contest open to students and to alumni. The medal records twelve feet and four inches as the distance covered.

A prize contest always fired William's ambition. It may interest the boys who read these pages to know of his record on this point, and to note his gradual rise. During his first year at the Academy he declaimed Patrick Henry's masterpiece, and not only failed to win a prize, but ranked well down in the list. Nothing daunted, the second year found him again entered with "The Palmetto and the Pine" as his subject. This time he ranked third. The next year, when a Freshman, he tried for a prize in Latin prose, and won half of the second prize. Later in the year, he declaimed 'Bernardo del Carpio,' and gained the second prize. In his Sophomore year he entered another contest, with an essay on the not altogether novel subject, "Labor." This time the first prize rewarded his work. An oration upon "Individual Powers" gave him the first prize in the Junior year. A part of this prize was a volume of Bryant's poems. Mr. Bryan gave me this book, his first gift, because it contained his favorite poem, an ode to a waterfowl, which concludes:

He who, from zone to zone,
Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
In the long way that I must tread alone,
Will lead my steps aright.

The winning of the Junior prize entitled him to represent Illinois College in the intercollegiate oratorical contest which was held at Galesburg, Illinois, in the fall of 1880. His oration was upon "Jus-

tice," and was awarded the second prize of fifty dollars. Gen. John C. Black, of Illinois, was one of the judges in this contest and marked Mr. Bryan one hundred on delivery. Upon invitation of Mr. Black, the young man called at the hotel and received many valuable suggestions upon the art of speaking. At the time of graduation he was elected class orator by his class, and, having the highest rank in scholarship during the four years' course, delivered the valedictory. Upon entering the academy, he joined the Sigma Pi society, and was an active member for six years, profiting much by the training in essay, declamation and debate.

My personal knowledge of Mr. Bryan dates from September, 1879. He was then entering upon his Junior year. At the risk of departing from the purpose of this biography, I shall speak of my first impressions. I saw him first in the parlors of the young ladies' school which I attended in Jacksonville. He entered the room with several other students, was taller than the rest, and attracted my attention at once. His face was pale and thin; a pair of keen, dark eyes looked out from beneath heavy brows; his nose was prominent—too large to look well, I thought; a broad, thin-lipped mouth and a square chin, completed the contour of his face. He was neat, though not fastidious in dress, and stood firmly and with dignity. I noted particularly his hair and his smile. The former, black in color, fine in quality, and parted distressingly straight; the latter, expansive and expressive. In later years this smile has been the subject of considerable comment, but the well-rounded cheeks of Mr. Bryan now check its onward march, and no one has seen the real breadth of the smile who did not see it in

the early days. Upon one occasion a heartless observer was heard to remark, "That man can whisper in his own ear," but this was a cruel exaggeration.

During the summer of 1880, Mr. Bryan attended his first political meeting. I record the details of this gathering for the encouragement of young speakers. He was to make a Democratic speech at a farmers' picnic near Salem, and the bills announced two other speakers, Mr. Bryan standing third upon the list. Upon reaching the grove, he found the two speakers and an audience of four, namely, the owner of the grove, one man in control of a wheel of fortune, and two men in charge of a lemonade stand. After waiting an hour for an audience which failed to come, the meeting adjourned *sine die*, and Mr. Bryan went home. Later in the fall, however, he made four speeches for Hancock and English, the first being delivered in the court house at Salem.

The graduating exercises of Illinois College occurred in June, 1881. Mr. Bryan's oration and valedictory address are given below, not because they possess great literary merit, but in order to show his style and the trend of his mind at that time.

GRADUATION ORATION. SUBJECT: CHARACTER.

It is said of the ermine that it will suffer capture rather than allow pollution to touch its glossy coat, but take away that coat and the animal is worthless.

We have ermines in higher life—those who love display. The desire to seem, rather than to be, is one of the faults which our age, as well as other ages, must deplore.

Appearance too often takes the place of reality—the stamp of the coin is there, and the glitter of the gold, but, after all, it is but a worthless wash. Sham is carried into every department of life, and we are being corrupted by show and surface. We are too apt to judge people by what they have, rather than by what they are; we have too few Hamlets who are bold enough to proclaim, "I know not seems!"

The counterfeit, however, only proves the value of the coin, and, although reputation may in some degree be taking the place of character, yet the latter has lost none of its worth, and, now, as of old, is a priceless gem, wherever found. Its absence and presence, alike, prove its value. Have you not conversed with those whose brilliant wit, pungent sarcasm, and well-framed sentences failed to conceal a certain indescribable something which made you distrust every word they uttered? Have you not listened to those whose eloquence dazzled, whose pretended earnestness enkindled in you an enthusiasm equal to their own, and yet, have you not felt that behind all this there was lurking a monster that repelled the admiration which their genius attracted? Are there not those, whom like the Greeks we fear, even when they are bringing gifts? That something is want of character, or, to speak more truly, the possession of bad character, and it shows itself alike in nations and individuals.

Eschines was talented; his oration against the crowning of Demosthenes was a masterly production, excellently arranged, elegantly written and effectively delivered; so extraordinary was its merits, that, when he afterward, as an exile, delivered it before a Rodian audience, they expressed their astonishment that it had not won for him his cause, but it fell like a chilling blast upon his hearers at Athens, because he was the "hireling of Philip."

Napoleon swept like a destroying angel over almost the entire eastern world, evincing a military genius unsurpassed, skill marvelous in its perfection, and a courage which savored almost of rashness, yet ever demonstrated the wisdom of its dictates. For a while he seemed to have robbed fortune of her secret, and bewildered nations gazed in silence while he turned the streams of success according to his vacillating whims.

Although endowed with a perception keen enough to discern the hidden plans of opposing generals, he could but see one road to immortality—a path which led through battle-fields and marshes wet with human gore; over rivers of blood and streams of tears that flowed from orphans' eyes—a path along whose length the widow's wail made music for its marching hosts. But he is fallen, and over his tomb no mourner weeps. Talent, genius, power, these he had—character, he had none.

But there are those who have both influence through life and unending praises after death; there are those who have by their ability inspired the admiration of the people and held it by the purity of their character. It is often remarked that some men have a name greater than their works will justify; the secret lies in the men themselves.

It was the well-known character of Demosthenes, not less than his eloquent words; his deep convictions, not less than the fire of his utterance; his own patriotism, not less than his invectives against the Macedonian that brought to the lips of the reanimated Greeks that memorable sentence, "Let us go against Philip."

Perhaps we could not find better illustrations of the power and worth of character than are presented in the lives of two of our own countrymen—names about which cluster in most sacred nearness the affections of the American people—honored dust over which have fallen the truest tears of sorrow ever shed by a nation for its heroes—the father and savior of their common country—the one, the appointed guardian of its birth; the other, the preserver of its life.

Both were reared by the hand of Providence for the work entrusted to their care, both were led by nature along the rugged path of poverty; both formed a character whose foundations were laid broad and deep in the purest truths of morality—a character which stood unshaken amid the terrors of war and the tranquillity of peace; a character which allowed neither cowardice upon the battle-field nor tyranny in the presidential chair. Thus did they win the hearts of their countrymen and prepare for themselves a lasting place of rest in the tender memories of a grateful people.

History but voices our own experience when it awards to true nobility of character the highest place among the enviable possessions of man.

Nor is it the gift of fortune. In this, at least, we are not creatures of circumstances; talent, special genius may be the gift of nature; position in society the gift of birth; respect may be bought with wealth; but neither one nor all of these can give character. It is a slow but sure growth to which every thought and action lends its aid. To form character is to form grooves in which are to flow the purposes of our lives. It is to adopt principles which are to be the measure of our actions, the criteria of our deeds. This we are doing each day, either consciously or unconsciously. There is character formed by our association with each friend, by every aspiration of the heart, by every object toward which our affections go out, yea, by every thought that flies on its lightning wing through the dark recesses of the brain.

It is a law of mind that it acts most readily in familiar paths, hence, repetition forms habit, and almost before we are aware, we are chained to a certain routine of action from which it is difficult to free ourselves. We imitate that which we admire. If we revel in stories of blood, and are pleased with the sight of barbaric cruelty, we find it easy to become a Caligula or a Domitian; we picture to ourselves scenes of cruelty in which we are actors, and soon await only the opportunity to vie in atrocity with the Neroes of the past.

If we delight in gossip, and are not content unless each neighbor is laid upon the dissecting table, we form a character unenviable indeed, and must be willing to bear the contempt of all the truly good, while we roll our bit of scandal as a sweet morsel under the tongue.

But if each day we gather some new truths, plant ourselves more firmly upon principles which are eternal, guard every thought and action, that it may be pure, and conform our

lives more nearly to that Perfect Model, we shall form a character that will be a fit background on which to paint the noblest deeds and the grandest intellectual and moral achievements; a character that cannot be concealed, but which will bring success in this life and form the best preparation for that which is beyond.

The formation of character is a work which continues through life, but at no time is it so active as in youth and early manhood. At this time impressions are most easily made, and mistakes most easily corrected. It is the season for the sowing of the seed—the springtime of life. There is no complaint in the natural world because each fruit and herb brings forth after its kind; there is no complaint if a neglected seed-time brings a harvest of want; there is no cry of injustice if thistles spring from thistle-seed sown. As little reason have we to murmur if in after-life we discover a character dwarfed and deformed by the evil thoughts and actions of to-day; as little reason have we to impeach the wisdom of God if our wild oats, as they are called in palliation, leave scars upon our manhood, which years of reform fail to wear away.

Character is the entity, the individuality of the person, shining from every window of the soul, either as a beam of purity, or as a clouded ray that betrays the impurity within. The contest between light and darkness, right and wrong, goes on; day by day, hour by hour, moment by moment, our characters are being formed, and this is the all-important question which comes to us in accents ever growing fainter as we journey from the cradle to the grave, "Shall those characters be good or bad?"

VALEDICTORY.

Beloved instructors, it is character not less than intellect that you have striven to develop. As we stand at the end of our college course, and turn our eyes toward the scenes forever past—as our memories linger on the words of wisdom which have fallen from your lips, we are more and more deeply impressed with the true conception of duty which you have ever shown. You have sought not to trim the lamp of genius until the light of morality is paled by its dazzling brilliance, but to encourage and strengthen both. These days are over. No longer shall we listen to your warning voices, no more meet you in these familiar class-rooms, yet on our hearts "deeply has sunk the lesson" you have given, "and shall not soon depart."

We thank you for your kind and watchful care, and shall ever cherish your teachings with that devotion which sincere gratitude inspires.

It is fitting that we express to you also, honored trustees, our gratitude for the privileges which you have permitted us to enjoy.

The name of the institution whose interests you guard, will

ever be dear to us as the school-room, to whose influence we shall trace whatever success coming years may bring.

Dear classmates, my lips refuse to bid you a last good-bye; we have so long been joined together in a community of aims and interests; so often met and mingled our thoughts in confidential friendship; so often planned and worked together, that it seems like rending asunder the very tissues of the heart to separate us now.

But this long and happy association is at an end, and now as we go forth in sorrow, as each one must to begin, alone the work which lies before us, let us encourage each other with strengthening words.

Success is brought by continued labor and continued watchfulness. We must struggle on, not for one moment hesitate, nor take one backward step; for in language of the poet—

The gates of hell are open night and day,
Smooth the descent and easy is the way;
But to return and view the cheerful sky
In this, the task and mighty labor lie.

We launch our vessels upon the¹ uncertain sea of life alone, yet, not alone, for around us are friends who anxiously and prayerfully watch our course. They will rejoice if we arrive safely at our respective havens, or weep with bitter tears, if, one by one, our weather-beaten barks are lost forever in the surges of the deep.

We have esteemed each other, loved each other, and now must from each other part. God grant that we may all so live as to meet in the better world, where parting is unknown.

Halls of learning, fond Alma Mater, farewell. We turn to take one "last, long, lingering look" at thy receding walls. We leave thee now to be ushered out into the varied duties of active life.

However high our names may be inscribed upon the gilded scroll of fame, to thee we all the honor give, to thee all praises bring. And when, in after years, we're wearied by the bustle of a busy world, our hearts will often long to turn and seek repose beneath thy sheltering shade.

When fall came, he entered the Union College of Law at Chicago. Out of school hours his time was spent in the office of ex-Senator Lyman Trumbull, who had been a political friend of Mr. Bryan's father. This acquaintance, together with the fact that a warm friendship existed between Mr. Bryan and his law school classmate, Henry Trumbull, the judge's son, led to the establishment of a second

foster home—a home in which he and his family have ever found a cordial welcome. In this home, but lately bereft of its head, he spent his first Sabbath after the Democratic National Convention.

Mr. Bryan stood well in law school, taking an especial interest in constitutional law. Here again, he was connected with the debating society of the college, and took an active part in its meetings. At graduation, his thesis was a defense of the jury system. His first fee was earned in the County Court at Salem.

To these years of study belong many things which are of interest to us, but which are too trivial for the public eye. I shall venture upon one, however. Many people have remarked upon the fondness which Mr. Bryan shows for quoting Scripture. This habit is one of long standing, as the following circumstance shows. The time came when it seemed proper to have a little conversation with my father and this was something of an ordeal, as father is rather a reserved man. In his dilemma, William sought refuge in the Scriptures, and began: "Mr. Baird, I have been reading Proverbs a good deal lately, and find that Solomon says: 'Whoso findeth a wife, findeth a good thing, and obtaineth favour of the Lord!'" Father, being something of a Bible scholar himself, replied: "Yes, I believe Solomon did say that, but Paul suggests that, while he that marrieth doeth well, he that marrieth not doeth better." This was disheartening, but the young man saw his way through. "Solomon would be the best authority upon this point," he rejoined, "because Paul was never married, while Solomon had a number of wives." After this friendly tilt the matter was satisfactorily arranged.

A LAWYER.

On July 4, 1883, Mr. Bryan began the practice of his profession in Jacksonville, Illinois. Desk room was obtained in the office of Brown & Kirby, one of the leading firms in the city, and the struggle encountered by all young professional men began. The first six months were rather trying to his patience, and he was compelled to supplement his earnings by a small draft upon his father's estate. Toward the close of the year, he entered into correspondence with his former law school classmate, Henry Trumbull, then located at Albuquerque, New Mexico, and discussed with him the advisability of removing to that territory. After the 1st of January, however, clients became more numerous, and he felt encouraged to make Jacksonville his permanent home. The following spring he took charge of the collection department of Brown & Kirby's office, and in a little more than a year his income seemed large enough to support two. During the summer of 1884, a modest home was planned and built, and on October 1, 1884, we were married.

During the next three years we lived comfortably, though economically, and laid by a small amount. Politics lost none of its charms, and each campaign found Mr. Bryan speaking, usually in our own county.

Three years after graduation, he attended the commencement at Illinois College, delivered the Master's oration, and received the degree. His subject on that occasion was "American Citizenship."

In the summer of 1887, legal business called him to Kansas and Iowa, and a Sabbath was spent in Lincoln, Nebraska, with a law school classmate,

Mr. A. R. Talbot. Mr. Bryan was greatly impressed with the beauty and business enterprise of Lincoln, and with the advantages which a growing capital furnishes for a young lawyer. He returned to Illinois full of enthusiasm for the West, and perfected plans for our removal thither. No political ambitions entered into this change of residence, as the city, county, and state were strongly Republican. He arrived in Lincoln, October 1, 1887, and a partnership was formed with Mr. Talbot. As Mr. Bryan did not share in the salary which Mr. Talbot received as a railroad attorney, he had to begin again at the bottom of the ladder. During this winter Ruth and I remained in Jacksonville, and in the spring following a second house was built—the one we now occupy—and the family was reunited in its Western home. The practice again became sufficient for our needs, and during the three years which followed we were again able to add to our reserve fund. I might here suggest an answer to a hostile criticism, namely, that Mr. Bryan did not distinguish himself as a lawyer. Those who thus complain should consider that he entered the practice at twenty-three and left it at thirty, and during that period began twice, and twice became more than self-supporting. At the time of his election to Congress his practice was in a thriving condition, and fully equal to that of any man of his age in the city. Mr. Bryan often met such demands as are commonly made upon lawyers in the way of short addresses, toasts, etc. Some of this post-prandial oratory discussed questions of public importance. The following was a toast upon "The Law and the Gospel," delivered in the spring of 1890 at a

banquet given by the St. Paul Methodist church of Lincoln, in honor of some distinguished visitors:

THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is rather by accident than by design that this sentiment has fallen to me. Had not my law partner been called unexpectedly from the State he would have responded with more propriety and more ability to "The Law and the Gospel."

These are important words; each covers a wide field by itself and together they include all government. There is not between them, as some suppose, a wide gulf fixed. Many have commenced with us only to be called to a higher sphere, and a few ministers have come to us when they were convinced that they had answered to another's call.

In the earlier days the prophet was also the lawgiver. He who wore the priestly robe held in his hands the scales of justice. But times are changed. For the good of the State and for the welfare of the church, the moral and the civil law have been separated. To-day we owe a double allegiance, and "render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Their governments are concentric circles and can never interfere. Between what religion commands and what the law compels there is, and ever must be, a wide margin, as there is also between what religion forbids and what the law prohibits. In many things we are left to obey or disobey the instructions of the Divine Ruler, answerable to Him only for our conduct. The gospel deals with the secret purposes of the heart as well as with the outward life, while the civil law must content itself with restraining the arm outstretched for another's hurt or with punishing the actor after the injury is done.

Next to the ministry I know of no more noble profession than the law. The object aimed at is justice, equal and exact, and if it does not reach that end at once it is because the stream is diverted by selfishness or checked by ignorance. Its principles ennoble and its practice elevates. If you point to the pettifogger, I will answer that he is as much out of place in the temple of justice as is the hypocrite in the house of God. You will find the "book on tricks" in the library of the legal bankrupt—nowhere else. In no business in life do honesty, truthfulness, and uprightness of conduct pay a larger dividend upon the investment than in the law. He is not only blind to his highest welfare and to his greatest good, but also treading upon dangerous ground, who fancies that mendacity, loquacity, and pertinacity are the only accomplishments of a successful lawyer.

You cannot judge a man's life by the success of a moment, by the victory of an hour, or even by the results of a



PORTRAIT OF RUTH BAIRD BRYAN.



PORTRAIT OF WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, JR.

year. You must view his life as a whole. You must stand where you can see the man as he treads the entire path that leads from the cradle to the grave—now crossing the plain, now climbing the steeps, now passing through pleasant fields, now wending his way with difficulty between rugged rocks—tempted, tried, tested, triumphant. The completed life of every lawyer, either by its success or failure, emphasizes the words of Solomon—"The path of the just is as a shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

By practicing upon the highest plane the lawyer may not win the greatest wealth, but he wins that which wealth cannot purchase and is content to know and feel that "a good name is rather to be chosen than great riches; and loving favor rather than silver and gold."

There are pioneers of the gospel whose names you speak with reverence, Calvin, Knox, the Wesleys, and Asbury, besides many still living, and you love them not without cause. There are those in our profession whom we delight to honor. Justinian and Coke, Blackstone and Jay, Marshall and Kent, Story and Lincoln, men who have stood in the thickest of the fight, have met every temptation peculiar to our profession, and yet maintained their integrity.

It is a fact to which we point with no little pride, that with a history of an hundred years no member of the Supreme Court of the United States has ever been charged with corrupt action, although untold millions have been involved in the litigation before the court. Nor do I now recall any member of the supreme court of any State who has been convicted of misusing his office.

"The Law and the Gospel." Great in their honored names, great in their history, great in their influence. To a certain extent they supplement each other. The law asks of the gospel counsel, not commands. The gospel goes far beyond the reach of law, for while the law must cease to operate when its subject dies, the gospel crosses the dark river of death and lightens up the world which lies beyond the tomb. The law is negative, the gospel positive; the law says "do not unto others that which you would not have others do unto you," while the gospel declares that we should "do to others that which we would that others should do unto us."

"The Law and the Gospel." They form an exception to the rule that in union there is strength, for each is strongest when alone. And I believe that the greatest prosperity of the State and greatest growth of the church will be found when the law and the gospel walk, not hand in hand, but side by side.

IN POLITICS.

Mr. Bryan became actively connected with the Democratic organization in Nebraska immediately after coming to the State, his first political speech

being made at Seward in the spring of 1888. Soon afterward he went as a delegate to the State convention; this gave him an acquaintance with the leading Democrats of the State and resulted in a series of speeches. He made a canvass of the First Congressional district that fall in behalf of Hon. J. Sterling Morton, and also visited some thirty counties throughout the State. Mr. Morton was defeated by thirty-four hundred, the district being normally Republican.

When the campaign of 1890 opened, there seemed small hope of carrying the district and there was but little rivalry for the nomination. Mr. Bryan was selected without opposition, and at once began a vigorous campaign. An invitation to joint debate was issued by his committee and accepted by his opponent, Hon. W. J. Connell, of Omaha, who then represented the district. These debates excited attention throughout the State. I have always regarded the first debate of this series as marking an important epoch in Mr. Bryan's life. The meeting took place in Lincoln. I had never before seen Mr. Bryan so preoccupied and so intent on making his effort acceptable. He had the opening and the closing speeches. The hall was packed with friends of both candidates and applause was quite evenly divided until the closing speech. I dare not describe this scene as it stands out in my memory. The people had not expected such a summing-up of the discussion; each sentence contained an argument; the audience was surprised, pleased, and enthusiastic. The occasion was a Chicago convention in miniature, and was satisfactory to those most concerned. In addition to these eleven joint contests, Mr. Bryan made a thorough canvass, speaking

about eighty times and visiting every city and village in the district. Though these debates were crisp and sharp in argument, they were marked by the utmost friendliness between the opponents. At the close of the last debate, Mr. Bryan presented to Mr. Connell a copy of Gray's Elegy, with the following remarks:

PRESENTATION OF GRAY'S ELEGY.

Mr. Connell: We now bring to a close this series of debates which was arranged by our committees. I am glad that we have been able to conduct these discussions in a courteous and friendly manner. If I have, in any way, offended you in word or deed I offer apology and regret, and as freely forgive. I desire to present to you in remembrance of these pleasant meetings this little volume, because it contains "Gray's Elegy," in perusing which I trust you will find as much pleasure and profit as I have found. It is one of the most beautiful and touching tributes to humble life that literature contains. Grand in its sentiment and sublime in its simplicity, we may both find in it a solace in victory or defeat. If success should crown your efforts in this campaign, and it should be your lot "Th' applause of list'ning senates to command," and I am left

A youth to fortune and to fame unknown,

Forget not us who in the common walks of life perform our part, but in the hour of your triumph recall the verse:

Let not ambition mock their useful toil,
 Their homely joys and destiny obscure;
 Nor grandeur hear, with disdainful smile,
 The short and simple annals of the poor.

If, on the other hand, by the verdict of my countrymen, I shall be made your successor, let it not be said of you:

And melancholy marked him for her own,

But find sweet consolation in the thought:

Full many a gem of purest ray serene,
 The dark unfathomed caves of ocean bear;
 Full many a flower was born to blush unseen,
 And waste its sweetness on the desert air.

But whether the palm of victory is given to you or to me, let us remember those of whom the poet says:

Far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife,
 Their sober wishes never learn'd to stray;
 Along the cool sequester'd vale of life
 They keep the noiseless tenor of their way.

These are the ones most likely to be forgotten by the Government. When the poor and weak cry out for relief they, too, often hear no answer but "the echo of their cry," while the rich, the strong, the powerful are given an attentive ear. For this reason is class legislation dangerous and deadly. It takes from those least able to lose and gives to those who are least in need. The safety of our farmers and our laborers is not in special legislation, but in equal and just laws that bear alike on every man. The great masses of our people are interested, not in getting their hands into other people's pockets, but in keeping the hands of other people out of their pockets. Let me, in parting, express the hope that you and I may be instrumental in bringing our Government back to better laws which will give equal treatment without regard to creed or condition. I bid you a friendly farewell.

When the returns were all in, it was found that Mr. Bryan was elected by a plurality of 6,713. Desiring to give his entire time to his Congressional work, he, soon after election, so arranged his affairs as to retire from practice, although retaining a nominal connection with the firm.

In the speakership caucus with which Congress opened, Mr. Bryan supported Mr. Springer, in whose district we had lived when at Jacksonville; in the House, he voted for Mr. Crisp, the caucus nominee. Mr. Springer was made chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and it was largely through his influence that Mr. Bryan was given a place upon that committee. His first speech of consequence was the tariff speech of March 16, 1892. This was the second important event in his career as a public speaker. The place which he held upon the Ways and Means Committee is rarely given to a new member, and he wished the speech to justify the appointment. It is perhaps unnecessary for me to comment at length upon the reception accorded this speech, as the press at the time gave such reports that the occasion will probably be remembered by those who read this sketch. This speech

increased his acquaintance with public men, and added to his strength at home. More than one hundred thousand copies were circulated by members of Congress. Upon his return to Nebraska, he was able to secure re-election in a new district (the State having been reapportioned in 1891) which that year gave the Republican state ticket a plurality of 6,500. His opponent this time was Judge A. W. Field of our own city. The Democratic committee invited the Republicans to join in arranging a series of debates, and this invitation was accepted. This was even a more bitter contest than the campaign of 1890, Mr. McKinley, Mr. Foraker, and others being called to Nebraska to aid the Republican candidate. Besides the eleven debates, which aroused much enthusiasm, Mr. Bryan again made a thorough canvass of the district. The victory was claimed by both sides until the Friday following the election, when the result was determined by official count, Mr. Bryan receiving a plurality of 140.

In the Fifty-third Congress, Mr. Bryan was reappointed upon the Ways and Means Committee and assisted in the preparation of the Wilson bill. He was a member of the sub-committee (consisting of Representatives MacMillan, Montgomery, and himself) which drafted the income tax portion of the bill. In the spring of 1893, through the courtesy of the State Department, Mr. Bryan obtained a report from the several European nations which collect an income tax, and the results of this research were embodied in the Congressional Records during the debate. He succeeded in having incorporated in the bill a provision borrowed from the Prussian law whereby the citizens who have taxable incomes make their own returns, and those whose incomes

are within the exemption are relieved from annoyance. On behalf of the committee, Mr. Bryan closed the debate upon the income tax, replying to Mr. Cockran.

During the discussion of the Wilson bill, Mr. Bryan spoke in its defense. His principal work of the term, however, was in connection with monetary legislation. His speech of August 16, 1893, in opposition to the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law brought out even more hearty commendation than his first tariff speech. Of this effort, it may be said that it contained the results of three years of careful study upon the money question.

While in Congress he made a fruitless effort to secure the passage of the following bill:

Be it enacted, etc.: That section 800 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, of 1878, be amended by adding thereto the words "In civil cases the verdict of three-fourths of the jurors constituting the jury shall stand as the verdict of the jury, and such a verdict shall have the same force and effect as a unanimous verdict."

The desire to have the law changed so as to permit less than a unanimous verdict in civil cases, was one which he had long entertained. In February, 1890, in response to a toast at a bar association banquet in Lincoln, he spoke upon the jury system, advocating the same reform. His remarks were as follows:

THE JURY SYSTEM.

One of the questions which has been for some time discussed, and which is now the subject of controversy, is, "Has the jury system outlived its usefulness?"

I think I voice the opinion of most of those present when to the question I answer an emphatic No.

To defend this answer it will not be necessary to recall the venerable age of the system, its past achievements, or the splendid words of praise which have been uttered in its behalf. It finds ample excuse for its existence in the needs of to-day.

The circumstances which called it into life have passed away, and many of its characteristics have been entirely changed, but never, I am persuaded, in the history of the English-speaking people, has the principle which underlies the trial by jury been more imperatively demanded than it is to-day.

This is an age of rapid accumulation of wealth, and the multiplication of corporations gives to money an extraordinary power.

One million dollars in the hands of one man or one company will outweigh, in the political and social world, ten times that sum divided among a thousand people. Can the temple of justice hope to escape its polluting touch without some such barrier as that which the jury system raises for its protection? Is there not something significant in the direction from which much of the complaint against the system comes?

If the question, "Shall the jury be abandoned or retained?" were submitted to a vote, we would find prominent among the opposing forces the corporate influences, the wealthy classes, and those busy citizens to whom jury service, or even the duty of an elector, is a burden.

While the great mass of its supporters would be found among those who are compelled to fight the battle of life unaided by those powerful allies—social position, political influence, and money—men whose only sword is the ballot, and whose only shield, the jury. The jury system is not perfect—we do not look for perfection in government—but it has this great advantage, that if the verdict falls to one side of the straight line of the law it is usually upon the side of the poorest adversary.

All stand equal before the law, whether they be rich or poor, high or low, weak or strong; but no system has yet been devised which will insure exact justice at all times between man and man.

We choose not between a perfect system and an imperfect one, but between an imperfect system and one more imperfect still. And if the scales of justice cannot be perfectly poised, the safety of society demands that they tip most easily toward the side of the weak.

Faith in trial by jury implies no reflection upon the integrity of the bench. We recall with pardonable pride the names of our illustrious judges whose genius and learning have given luster to our profession and whose purity and probity have crowned it with glory.

But they won their distinction in expounding the law and left the decision of the facts to those fresh from contact with the busy world.

If to the present duties of the judge we add those now discharged by the jury, is it not possible that the selection of a judge will be secured because of his known sympathies? Will not the standard be so lowered that we may see upon the bench an agent instead of an arbiter?

In what position will the suitor be who finds, when called before a biased tribunal, that he has neither peremptory challenge nor challenge for cause. No more fatal blow could be struck at our national welfare than to give occasion for the belief that in our courts a man's redress depends upon his ability to pay for it.

If the jury can guard the court room from the invasion of unfair influences it will be as valuable for what it prevents as for what it gives.

Time does not admit of extended reference to those faults in the system which give occasion for just criticism, faults which its friends are in duty bound to prune away from it. The requirement of an unanimous verdict causes many mistrials. In civil causes, where a decision follows the evidence, it is difficult to see why substantial justice would not be done by a majority, or, at most, a two-thirds majority verdict; but we cannot abandon the old rule in criminal cases without trespassing on the sacred right of the accused to the benefit of every reasonable doubt; for a divided jury, in itself, raises a doubt as to his guilt. The law recently passed making it a misdemeanor for a man to ask for appointment as a juror, or for an attorney to seek a place for a friend, is a step in the right direction.

Between a partisan juror and a professional juror it is only a choice between evils. If to fill the panel with bystanders means to fill it with men standing by for the purpose of being called, we are ready for a law which will compel the sheriff to seek talesmen beyond the limits of the court house. Any change, the aim of which is to compel the selection of men of ordinary intelligence and approved integrity as jurors, will be acceptable to the people. But now that all men read the news, the information thus acquired should no longer render them incompetent for jury service. It is a premium upon ignorance which we cannot afford to pay. Instead of summoning a jurymen for a whole term we should limit his service to one or two weeks. This would lighten the burden without impairing the principle. To that argument, however, which assumes that business men can afford no time for jury service there can be but one answer, No government can long endure unless its citizens are willing to make some sacrifice for its existence.

In this, our land, we are called upon to give but little in return for the advantages which we receive. Shall we give that little grudgingly? Our definition of patriotism is often too narrow.

Shall the lover of his country measure his loyalty only by his service as a soldier? No! Patriotism calls for the faithful and conscientious performance of all of the duties of citizenship, in small matters as well as great, at home as well as upon the tented field.

There is no more menacing feature in these modern times than the disinclination of what are called the better classes to

assume the burdens of citizenship. If we desire to preserve to future generations the purity of our courts and the freedom of our people, we must lose no opportunity to impress upon our citizens the fact that above all pleasure, above all convenience, above all business, they must place their duty to their government; for a good government doubles every joy and a bad government multiplies every sorrow. Times change but principles endure. The jury has protected us from the abuse of power.

While human government exists the tendency to abuse power will remain. This system, coming down from former generations crowned with the honors of age, is to-day and for the future our hope.

Let us correct its defects with kindly hands, let us purge it of its imperfections and it will be, as in the past, the bulwark of our liberties.

Besides the work which I have mentioned, Mr. Bryan spoke briefly upon several other questions, namely, in favor of the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people, and in favor of the anti-option bill; in opposition to the railroad pooling bill and against the extension of the Pacific liens.

In the Fifty-third Congress, the Democrats adopted a rule which was somewhat similar to the one in force under Speaker Reed, providing for the counting of a quorum. Mr. Bryan opposed this rule and I quote the reasons which he then gave in support of his position.

COUNTING A QUORUM.

The question upon which we are called to act is one of a great deal more importance than some members seem to think, and the objection which is made to the rule by some of us, who have not been able to favor it, is based upon reasons far more weighty than gentlemen have assumed.

The constitution of the State of Nebraska, which I have the honor in part to represent, contains this provision:

No bill shall be passed unless by assent of a majority of all the members elected to each House of the Legislature, and the question upon the final passage shall be taken immediately upon its last reading, and the yeas and nays shall be entered upon the journal.

The constitutions of a majority of the States of the Union,

among them the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and I might name them all if time permitted, provide the same, the object being to prevent less than one half of all the members elected to the Legislature from passing laws. It is only by the concurrence of a majority of the members that we can know that the majority of the people desire the law. The Constitution of the United States does not contain a similar provision; and there is no question, since the decision of the Supreme Court, that it is within the power of this House to declare by rule in what manner a quorum may be ascertained. It can be done in the manner provided in this rule, or it can be done by the call of the yeas and nays, as it has been done for a hundred years. Now, the question with me is this: Which is the safer plan? According to the rule which has been in vogue a hundred years, the minority has the safeguard which is expressly secured in the constitutions of a majority of the States: according to the old rule the minority, by refusing to vote, can compel the concurrence of a majority before a law is passed.

Now, I believe that is a wise provision. I do not see why it is wiser in a State than in Congress; I do not know why it is necessary that the members of the Legislature in my State, or in New York, should be compelled to vote yea or nay when a bill shall pass, and that a majority shall concur, unless the same reasons apply in this body.

We are asked to change this rule, which has been in operation since the beginning of the Government, and adopt a new rule; a rule not intended to enable the majority to rule, but to enable less than one-half of the members of Congress to pass laws for this country. I believe that the innovation is a dangerous one. There is far more safety in giving to the minority the power to delay legislation until a majority have expressed themselves in favor of a law. How can you tell that the people of the United States desire a particular law except by the voice of their representatives; and how can we tell that their representatives believe the bill should become a law until they have expressed themselves by vote in favor of the proposition?

In the spring of 1894, Mr. Bryan announced that he would not be a candidate for re-election to Congress, and later decided to stand as a candidate for the United States Senate. He was nominated for that office by the unanimous vote of the Democratic State Convention. While the Republicans made no nomination, it seemed certain that Mr. Thurston would be their candidate and the Democratic committee accordingly issued a challenge to him for a

series of debates. The Republicans were also invited to arrange a debate between Mr. McKinley and Mr. Bryan, Mr. McKinley having at that time an appointment to speak in Nebraska. The latter invitation was declined, but two meetings were arranged with Mr. Thurston. These were the largest political gatherings ever held in the State and were as gratifying to the friends of Mr. Bryan as his previous debates. During the campaign, Mr. Bryan made a canvass of the State, speaking four or five hours each day, and sometimes riding thirty miles over rough roads between speeches. At the election, Nebraska shared in the general landslide; the Republicans had a large majority in the Legislature and elected Mr. Thurston.

This defeat was a disappointment, but it did not discourage Mr. Bryan, as is evident from an address to his supporters, extracts from which follow :

LETTER TO FRIENDS AFTER SENATORIAL DEFEAT.

* * * * *

The Legislature is Republican, and a Republican Senator will now be elected to represent Nebraska. This may be mortifying to the numerous chairmen who have introduced me to audiences as "the next Senator from Nebraska," but it illustrates the uncertainty of prophecies.

I appreciate more than words can express the cordial good will and the loyal support of the friends to whom I am indebted for the political honors which I have received. I am especially grateful to those who bear without humiliation the name of the common people, for they have been my friends when others have deserted me. I appreciate also the kind words of many who have been restrained by party ties from giving me their votes. I have been a hired man for four years, and, now that the campaign is closed, I may be pardoned for saying that as a public servant I have performed my duty to the best of my ability, and am not ashamed of the record made.

I stepped from private life into national politics at the bidding of my countrymen; at their bidding I again take my place in the ranks and resume without sorrow the work from which they called me. It is the glory of our institutions

that public officials exercise authority by the consent of the governed rather than by divine or hereditary right. Paraphrasing the language of Job, each public servant can say of departing honors: The people gave and the people have taken away, blessed be the name of the people.

Speaking of my own experience in politics, I may again borrow an idea from the great sufferer and say: What, shall we receive good at the hands of the people, and shall we not receive evil? I have received good even beyond my deserts and I accept defeat without complaint. I ask my friends not to cherish resentment against any one who may have contributed to the result.

* * * * *

The friends of these reforms have fought a good fight; they have kept the faith and they will not have finished their course until the reforms are accomplished. Let us be grateful for the progress made, and "with malice toward none and charity for all" begin the work of the next campaign.

Mr. Bryan received the votes of all the Democrats and of nearly half of the Populist members. It might be suggested here that while Mr. Bryan had never received a nomination from the Populist party, he had been, since 1892, materially aided by individual members of that organization. In Nebraska, the Democratic party has been in the minority, and as there are several points of agreement between it and the Populist party, Mr. Bryan advocated co-operation between the two. In the spring of 1893, he received the support of a majority of the Democratic members of the Legislature, but, when it became evident that no Democrat could be elected, he assisted in the election of Senator Allen, a Populist. Again, in 1894, in the Democratic State Convention, he aided in securing the nomination of a portion of the Populist ticket, including Mr. Holcomb, Populist candidate for Governor. The cordial relations which existed between the Democrats and Populists in Nebraska were a potent influence in securing his nomination at Chicago.

On September 1, 1894, Mr. Bryan became chief of the editorial staff of the Omaha World-Herald, and from that date until the last national convention gave a portion of his time to this work. This position enabled him daily to reach a large number of people in the discussion of public questions and also added considerably to his income. While the contract fixed a certain amount of editorial matter as a minimum, his interest in the work was such that he generally exceeded rather than fell below the required space.

After the adjournment of Congress Mr. Bryan, on his way home, lectured at Cincinnati, Nashville, Tenn., Little Rock, Ark., and at several points in Missouri, arriving in Lincoln March 19, his thirty-fifth birthday. The Jefferson Club tendered him a reception and an opera house packed with an appreciative audience rendered this a very gratifying occasion to Mr. Bryan. As he was no longer in public life, and could show no favors in return, the disinterested friendship shown will always be remembered with pleasure. He chose as his theme, "Thomas Jefferson still lives," and, after reviewing the work of the Fifty-third Congress, discussed at length the principles of his patron saint. His admiration for the Sage of Monticello is so well known that I quote a tribute which he once paid him:

Let us then with the courage of Andrew Jackson apply to present conditions the principles taught by Thomas Jefferson—Thomas Jefferson the greatest constructive statesman whom the world has ever known; the grandest warrior who ever battled for human liberty! He quarried from the mountain of eternal truth the four pillars, upon whose strength all popular government must rest. In the Declaration of American Independence he proclaimed the principles with which there is, without which there cannot be "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people." When he declared that "all

men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," he declared all that lies between the Alpha and Omega of Democracy.

Alexander "wept for other worlds to conquer" after he had carried his victorious banner throughout the then known world: Napoleon "rearranged the map of Europe with his sword" amid the lamentations of those by whose blood he was exalted; but when these and other military heroes are forgotten and their achievements disappear in the cycle's sweep of years, children will still lisp the name of Jefferson, and freemen will ascribe due praise to him who filled the kneeling subject's heart with hope and bade him stand erect—a sovereign among his peers.

Mr. Bryan intended to resume the practice of law and re-open his office. At this time, however, the contest for supremacy in the Democratic party had begun in earnest and calls for speeches were so numerous and so urgent that it seemed best to devote his time to lecturing and to the public discussion of the money question. In view of the suggestions which have been made that Mr. Bryan was in the pay of the silver league, I will be pardoned for speaking of the earnings during these months. His editorial salary formed the basis of his income. When lecturing before Chautauquas and similar societies he was paid as other lecturers. At meetings where no admission was charged he sometimes received compensation and at other times received nothing. Many of the free speeches were made en route to lecture engagements, and his compensation ranged from traveling expenses to one hundred dollars. Only upon two or three occasions did he receive more than this. Never at any time was he under the direction of, or in the pay of, any silver league or association of persons pecuniarily interested in silver. During the interim between the adjournment of Congress and the Chicago conven-

tion he spoke in all the States of the West and South, and became acquainted with those most prominently connected with the silver cause.

I have briefly outlined the life and political career of Mr. Bryan. Perhaps it may please the reader to add a few words concerning his home life.

Our children are three. Ruth Baird is now eleven; William Jennings, Jr., is seven and a half, and Grace Dexter will soon be six. The older girl is said to be very much like her mother; the younger strongly resembles her father; and the son seems a composite photograph of both parents. Though for several years past, Mr. Bryan's work has often called him from home, he arranges to return for the Sabbath whenever possible.

During his service in Congress, the family spent three of the five sessions with him in Washington. We found a very comfortable and pleasant home at 131 B street, S. E., with Mr. C. T. Bride, and here the four years were spent. No member can live within his salary and make much of social life. We did little visiting, but were often found at lectures and heard many actors of note. The National Library was an endless source of pleasure and many rare books were read during those years. Though an advocate of an eight hour day, Mr. Bryan has, during the last thirteen years, averaged nearly twelve hours a day at professional and literary work.

He spoke on several occasions outside of Congress. The two most important speeches delivered were, the one at Tammany Hall, July 4, 1892, the other, at the National Cemetery at Arlington, May 30, 1894. I insert the latter. The scene was impressive and the audience representative. President Cleveland and four of his Cabinet were in attendance.

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS.

With flowers in our hands and sadness in our hearts we stand amid the tombs where the nation's dead are sleeping. It is appropriate that the Chief Executive is here, accompanied by his Cabinet; it is appropriate that the soldier's widow is here, and the soldier's son; it is appropriate that here are assembled, in numbers growing less each year, the scarred survivors, Federal and Confederate, of our last great war; it is appropriate, also, that these exercises in honor of comrades dead should be conducted by comrades still surviving. All too soon the day will come when these graves must be decorated by hands unused to implements of war, and when these speeches must be made by lips that never answered to a roll call.

We, who are of the aftermath, cannot look upon the flag with the same emotions that thrill you who have followed it as your pillar of cloud by day and your pillar of fire by night, nor can we appreciate it as you can who have seen it waving in front of reinforcements when succor meant escape from death; neither can we, standing by these blossom-covered mounds, feel as you have often felt when far away from home and on hostile soil you have laid your companions to rest; but from a new generation we can bring you the welcome assurance that the commemoration of this day will not depart with you. We may neglect the places where the nation's greatest victories have been won, but we cannot forget the Arlingtons which the nation has consecrated with its tears.


To ourselves as well as to the dead we owe the duty which we discharge here, for monuments and memorial days declare the patriotism of the living no less than the virtues of those whom they commemorate.

We would be blind indeed to our own interests and to the welfare of posterity if we were deaf to the just demands of the soldier and his dependents. We are grateful for the services rendered by our defenders, whether illustrious or nameless, and yet a nation's gratitude is not entirely unselfish, since by our regard for the dead we add to the security of the living; by our remembrance of those who have suffered we give inspiration to those upon whose valor we must hereafter rely, and prove ourselves worthy of the sacrifices which have been made and which may be again required.

The essence of patriotism lies in a willingness to sacrifice for one's country, just as true greatness finds expression, not in blessings enjoyed, but in good bestowed. Read the words inscribed on the monuments reared by loving hands to the heroes of the past; they do not speak of wealth inherited, or honors bought, or of hours in leisure spent, but of service done. Twenty years, forty years, a life or life's most precious blood he yielded up for the welfare of his fellows—this is the simple story which proves that it is now, and ever has been, more blessed to give than to receive.



PORTRAIT OF GRACE DEXTER BRYAN.



EXTERIOR VIEW OF LINCOLN HOME.

The officer was a patriot when he gave his ability to his country and risked his name and fame upon the fortunes of war; the private soldier was a patriot when he took his place in the ranks and offered his body as a bulwark to protect the flag; the wife was a patriot when she bade her husband farewell and gathered about her the little brood over which she must exercise both a mother's and a father's care; and, if there can be degrees in patriotism, the mother stood first among the patriots when she gave to the nation her sons, the divinely appointed support of her declining years, and as she brushed the tears away thanked God that he had given her the strength to rear strong and courageous sons for the battlefield.

To us who were born too late to prove upon the battlefield our courage and our loyalty it is gratifying to know that opportunity will not be wanting to show our love of country. In a nation like ours, where the Government is founded upon the principle of equality and derives its just powers from the consent of the governed; in a land like ours, I say, where every citizen is a sovereign and where no one cares to wear a crown, every year presents a battlefield and every day brings forth occasion for the display of patriotism.

And on this memorial day we shall fall short of our duty if we content ourselves with praising the dead or complimenting the living and fail to make preparations for those responsibilities which present times and present conditions impose upon us. We can find instruction in that incomparable address delivered by Abraham Lincoln on the battlefield of Gettysburg. It should be read as a part of the exercises of this day on each returning year as the Declaration of Independence is read on the Fourth of July. Let me quote from it, for its truths, like all truths, are applicable in all times and climes:

We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it far above our power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it cannot forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced.

"The Unfinished Work." Yes, every generation leaves to its successor an unfinished work. The work of society, the work of human progress, the work of civilization is never completed. We build upon the foundation which we find already laid and those who follow us take up the work where we leave off. Those who fought and fell thirty years ago did nobly advance the work in their day, for they led the nation up to higher grounds. Theirs was the greatest triumph in all history. Other armies have been inspired by love of conquest or have fought to repel a foreign enemy, but our armies held within the Union brethren who now rejoice at their own de-

feat and glory in the preservation of the nation which they once sought to dismember. No greater victory can be won by citizens or soldiers than to transform temporary foes into permanent friends. But let me quote again:

It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us; that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Aye, let us here dedicate ourselves anew to this unfinished work which requires of each generation constant sacrifice and unceasing care. Pericles, in speaking of those who fell at Salamis, explained the loyalty of his countrymen when he said:

It was for such a country, then, that these men, nobly resolving not to have it taken from them, fell fighting and every one of their survivors may well be willing to suffer in its behalf.

The strength of a nation does not lie in forts, nor in navies, nor yet in great standing armies, but in happy and contented citizens, who are ever ready to protect for themselves and to preserve for posterity the blessings which they enjoy. It is for us of this generation to so perform the duties of citizenship that a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

As a conclusion for this sketch, I have asked the publishers to give a picture of our library, the place where Mr. Bryan spends most of his time when at home and where, as he has often said, his happiest hours are passed. Our collection of books is more complete along the lines of economic subjects and in the works and lives of public men. The orations of Demosthenes and the writings of Jefferson afford him the greatest pleasure.

To give an estimate of his character or of the mental endowments which he may possess, would be beyond the scope of this article. I may be justified, however, in saying that his life has been one of earnest purpose, with that sort of genius which has been called "a capacity for hard work."

CHAPTER IV.

SPEECHES AND INTERVIEWS OF HON. W. J. BRYAN ON IMPERIALISM.

INTERVENTION IN CUBA.

“Yes, the time for intervention has arrived. Humanity demands that we shall act. Cuba lies within sight of our shores and the sufferings of her people cannot be ignored unless we, as a nation, have become so engrossed in money making as to be indifferent to distress.

“Intervention may be accompanied by danger and expense, but existence cannot be separated from responsibility and responsibility sometimes leads a nation, as well as an individual, into danger. A neighbor must sometimes incur danger for a neighbor, and a friend for a friend.

“War is a terrible thing and cannot be defended except as a means to an end, and yet it is sometimes the only means by which a necessary end can be secured. The state punishes its own citizens by imprisonment and even death when counsel and persuasion fail. War is the final arbiter between nations when reason and diplomacy are of no avail.

“Spain might not resist intervention; it is to be hoped that she would recognize the right of the United States to act, and immediately withdraw from Cuba, but whether she resents intervention or not, the United States must perform a plain duty.

“Our own interests justify intervention. Spain has governed Cuba so badly as to excite continuous re-

volt, and, after exciting revolt, has shown herself powerless to restore order and enforce law upon the island.

"Spanish rule in Cuba has disturbed the United States, interfered with business, increased the expense of guarding our shores and drawn upon the resources of our people to care for those made destitute by war. We have as much right to demand the cessation of war in the interest of the United States as Spain has to demand its continuance for her benefit.

"If the question is to be settled upon the basis of human rights, surely our people have waited long enough; if, on the other hand, pecuniary interests are to be considered, then it must be remembered that the loss suffered by the United States and Cuba together far exceeds any gain which Spain could reasonably expect to secure even if she had a hope of recovering Cuba by force of arms.

"Spain has only herself to blame for the condition of affairs in Cuba. If she denies to her former subjects the rights of war and calls the Cuban army a mob, let her remember the words of Victor Hugo: 'The mob is the human race in misery.' No nation can afford to make its people miserable.

"If the Cubans prefer death to Spanish rule it must be because Spanish rule has robbed life of joy and hope. If a nation sows the wind it must reap the whirlwind."

FIRST SPEECH AGAINST IMPERIALISM.

"Nebraska is ready to do her part in time of war as well as in time of peace. Her citizens were among the first to give expression to their sympathy with the Cuban patriots, and her representatives in the

Senate and House took a prominent part in the advocacy of armed intervention by the United States.

"When the President issued a call for volunteers Nebraska's quota was promptly furnished and she is prepared to respond to the second and subsequent calls.

"Nebraska's attitude upon the subject does not, however, indicate that the state is inhabited by a contentious or warlike people; it simply means that our people understand both the rights conferred, and the obligations imposed, by proximity to Cuba. Understanding these rights and obligations, they do not shrink from any consequences which may follow the performance of a national duty.

"War is harsh; it is attended by hardship and suffering; it means a vast expenditure of men and money. We may well pray for the coming of the day, promised in Holy Writ, when the swords shall be beaten into plowshares and the spears into pruning hooks; but universal peace cannot come until Justice is enthroned throughout the world. Jehovah deals with nations as He deals with men, and for both decrees that the wages of sin is death. Until the right has triumphed in every land and love reigns in every heart government must, as a last resort, appeal to force. As long as the oppressor is deaf to the voice of reason, so long must the citizen accustom his shoulder to the musket and his hand to the saber.

"Our nation exhausted diplomacy in its efforts to secure a peaceable solution of the Cuban question, and only took up arms when it was compelled to choose between war and servile acquiescence in cruelties which would have been a disgrace to barbarism.

"History will vindicate the position taken by the United States in the war with Spain. In saying this I assume that the principles which were invoked in

the inauguration of the war will be observed in its prosecution and conclusion. If, however, a contest undertaken for the sake of humanity degenerates into a war of conquest, we shall find it difficult to meet the charge of having added hypocrisy to greed. Is our national character so weak that we cannot withstand the temptation to appropriate the first piece of land that comes within our reach?

"To inflict upon the enemy all possible harm is legitimate warfare, but shall we contemplate a scheme for the colonization of the Orient merely because our ships won a remarkable victory in the harbor of Manila?

"Our guns destroyed a Spanish fleet, but can they destroy that self-evident truth, that governments derive their just powers, not from superior force, but from the consent of the governed?

"Shall we abandon a just resistance to European encroachment upon the Western hemisphere, in order to mingle in the controversies of Europe and Asia?

"Nebraska, standing midway between the oceans, will contribute her full share toward the protection of our sea coast; her sons will support the flag at home and abroad, wherever the honor and the interests of the nation may require. Nebraska will hold up the hands of the government while the battle rages, and when the war clouds roll away her voice will be heard pleading for the maintenance of those ideas which inspired the founders of our government and gave the nation its proud eminence among the nations of the earth.

"If others turn to thoughts of aggrandizement and yield allegiance to those who clothe land-covetousness in the attractive garb of 'national destiny' the people of Nebraska will, if I mistake not their sentiments, plant themselves upon the disclaimer entered by Con-

gress and insist that good faith shall characterize the making of peace as it did the beginning of war. Goldsmith calls upon statesmen

“* * * to judge how wide the limits stand
Betwixt a splendid and a happy land.’

‘If some dream of the splendors of a heterogeneous empire encircling the globe, we shall be content to aid in bringing enduring happiness to a homogeneous people, consecrated to the purpose of maintaining a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.’”

[Extract from speech delivered at Trans-Mississippi Exposition, Omaha, Neb., June 14, 1893]

THE SAVANNAH INTERVIEW.

“My reason for leaving the army was set forth in my letter to the adjutant-general tendering my resignation. Now that the treaty of peace has been concluded I believe that I can be more useful to my country as a civilian than as a soldier.

“I may be in error, but in my judgment our nation is in greater danger just now than Cuba. Our people defended Cuba against foreign arms; now they must defend themselves and their country against a foreign idea—the colonial idea of European nations. Heretofore greed has perverted the government and used its instrumentalities for private gains, but now the very foundation principles of our government are assaulted. Our nation must give up any intention of entering upon a colonial policy, such as is now pursued by European countries, or it must abandon the doctrine that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

“To borrow a Bible quotation, ‘A house divided against itself cannot stand.’ Paraphrasing Lincoln’s

declaration, I may add that this nation cannot endure half republic and half colony—half free and half vassal. Our form of government, our traditions, our present interests and our future welfare, all forbid our entering upon a career of conquest.

“Jefferson has been quoted in support of imperialism, but our opponents must distinguish between imperialism and expansion; they must also distinguish between expansion in the western hemisphere and an expansion that involves us in the quarrels of Europe and the Orient. They must still further distinguish between expansion which secures contiguous territory for future settlement, and expansion which secures us alien races for future subjugation.

“Jefferson favored the annexation of necessary contiguous territory on the North American continent, but he was opposed to wars of conquest and expressly condemned the acquiring of remote territory.

“Some think that the fight should be made against ratification of the treaty, but I would prefer another plan. If the treaty is rejected, negotiations must be renewed and instead of settling the question according to our ideas we must settle it by diplomacy, with the possibility of international complications. It will be easier, I think, to end the war at once by ratifying the treaty and then deal with the subject in our own way. The issue can be presented directly by a resolution of Congress declaring the policy of the nation upon this subject. The President in his message says that our only purpose in taking possession of Cuba is to establish a stable government and then turn that government over to the people of Cuba. Congress could reaffirm this purpose in regard to Cuba and assert the same purpose in regard to the Philippines and Porto Rico. Such a resolution would make a clear-cut issue between the doctrine of self-govern-

ment and the doctrine of imperialism. We should reserve a harbor and coaling station in Porto Rico and the Philippines in return for services rendered and I think we would be justified in asking the same concession from Cuba.

"In the case of Porto Rico, where the people have as yet expressed no desire for an independent government, we might with propriety declare our willingness to annex the island if the citizens desire annexation, but the Philippines are too far away and their people too different from ours to be annexed to the United States, even if they desired it."

[Interview at Savannah, Ga., December 13, 1898.]

THE NATIONAL EMBLEM.

"The flag is a national emblem and is obedient to the national will. It was made for the people, not the people for the flag. When the American people want the flag raised, they raise it; when they want it hauled down, they haul it down. The flag was raised upon Canadian soil during the war of 1812 and it was hauled down when peace was restored. The flag was planted upon Chapultepec during the war with Mexico and it was hauled down when the war was over. The morning papers announce that General Lee ordered the flag hauled down in Cuba yesterday, because it was raised too soon. The flag will be raised in Cuba again on the 1st of January, but the President declares in his message that it will be hauled down as soon as a stable government is established. Who will deny to our people the right to haul the flag down in the Philippines, if they so desire, when a stable government is established there?

"Our flag stands for an indissoluble union of in-

destructible states. Every state is represented by a star and every territory sees in the constitution a star of hope that will some day take its place in the constellation. What is there in the flag to awaken the zeal or reflect the aspirations of vassal colonies which are too good to be cast away, but not good enough to be admitted to the sisterhood of states?

“Shall we keep the Philippines and amend our flag? Shall we add a new star—the blood-star, Mars—to indicate that we have entered upon a career of conquest? Or shall we borrow the yellow, which in 1896 was the badge of gold and greed, and paint Saturn and his rings, to suggest a carpet-bag government, with its schemes of spoliation? Or shall we adorn our flag with a milky way composed of a multitude of minor stars representing remote and insignificant dependencies?

“No, a thousand times better that we haul down the stars and stripes and substitute the flag of an independent republic than surrender the doctrines that give glory to ‘Old Glory.’ It was the flag of our fathers in the years that are gone; it is the flag of a reunited country to-day; let it be the flag of our nation in the years that are to come. Its stripes of red tell of the blood that was shed to purchase liberty; its stripes of white proclaim the pure and heaven-born purpose of a government which derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. The mission of that flag is to float—not over a conglomeration of commonwealths and colonies—but over ‘the land of the free and the home of the brave;’ and to that mission it must remain forever true—forever true.”

[Extract from speech delivered at Lincoln, Neb., December 25, 1898, at reception tendered by The Woman's Bimetallic League, The Lancaster County Bimetallic League, and The University Bimetallic Club.]

"WHO SAVES HIS COUNTRY SAVES HIMSELF."

"You have labored diligently to prevent foreign financiers from disregarding the rights of the American people; now you are called upon to use your influence to prevent the American people from disregarding the rights of others. Self-restraint is a difficult virtue to practice. Solomon says that 'he that ruleth his own spirit is better than he that taketh a city.' The American people have shown that they can take a city; will they be able to restrain the spirit of conquest?

"It has been the boast of our nation that right makes might; shall we abandon the motto of the republic and go back a century to the monarchical motto which asserts that might makes right?

"Be not carried away by the excitement incident to war; it will soon subside. Our people will turn again to the paths of peace; justice will resume her reign.

"Be steadfast in the faith of the fathers; your fight is for yourselves as well as for your country. In the words of the distinguished Georgian, Hill: 'Who saves his country saves himself—and all things saved do bless him. Who lets his country die, lets all things die, dies himself ignobly—and all things, dying, curse him.'

"Imperialism finds its inspiration in dollars, not in duty. It is not our duty to burden our people with increased taxes in order to give a few speculators an opportunity for exploitation; it is not our duty to sacrifice the best blood of our nation in tropical jungles in an attempt to stifle the very sentiments which have given vitality to American institutions; it is not our duty to deny to the people of the Philippines the rights

for which our forefathers fought from Bunker Hill to Yorktown.

“Our nation has a mission, but it is to liberate those who are in bondage—not to place shackles upon those who are struggling to be free.

“We rejoice in the marvelous victory won by Dewey in Manila Bay; we would give to him a sacred place in history and crown his memory with blessings. To us he is a hero; to the Filipinos he can be a savior. Let him be known to posterity, not as the subjugator of an alien race, but as the redeemer of an oppressed people—not as a Lord Clive, but as a La Fayette. The gratitude of a people is better than a jeweled sword.”

[Extract from speech delivered at Nebraska Traveling Men's Bryan Club banquet, Lincoln, Neb., December 31, 1898.]

CINCINNATI SPEECH.

“The sentiment of the people upon any great question must be measured during the days of deliberation and not during the hours of excitement. A good man will sometimes be engaged in a fight, but it is not reasonable to expect a judicial opinion from him until he has had time to wash the blood off his face.

“I have seen a herd of mild-eyed, gentle kine transferred into infuriated beasts by the sight and scent of blood, and I have seen the same animals quiet and peaceful again in a few hours.

“We have much of the animal in us still in spite of civilizing processes. It is not unnatural that our people should be more sanguinary immediately after a battle than they were before, but it is only a question of time when reflection will restore the condi-

tions which existed before this nation became engaged in the war with Spain.

"When men are excited they talk about what they can do; when they are calm they talk about what they ought to do.

"If the President rightly interpreted the feelings of the people when they were intoxicated by a military triumph we shall appeal from 'Philip drunk to Philip sober.' The forcible annexation of the Philippine Islands would violate a principle of American public law deeply imbedded in the American mind.

"It is difficult to overestimate the influence which such a change in our national policy would produce on the character of our people. Our opponents ask, is our nation not great enough to do what England, Germany and Holland are doing? They inquire, can we not govern colonies as well as they?

"Whether we can govern colonies as well as other countries can is not material; the real question is whether we can, in one hemisphere, develop the theory that governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed, and at the same time inaugurate, support and defend in the other hemisphere a government which derives its authority entirely from superior force.

"And if these two ideas of government cannot live together which one shall we choose? To defend forcible annexation on the ground that we are carrying out a religious duty is worse than absurd.

"The Bible teaches us that it is more blessed to give than to receive, while the colonial policy is based upon the doctrine that it is more blessed to take than to leave. I am afraid that the imperialists have confused the beatitudes.

"I once heard of a man who mixed up the parable

of the good Samaritan with the parable of the sower, and in attempting to repeat the former, said:

“‘A man went from Jerusalem to Jericho and as he went he fell among thorns and the thorns sprang up and choked him.’

“We entered the Spanish war as peacemakers. Imperialists have an indistinct recollection that a blessing has been promised to the peacemakers and also to the meek, but their desire for more territory has perverted their memories, so that, as they recall the former, it reads: ‘Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall inherit the earth.’

“The meek are to inherit the earth, but the imperialists can hardly be classed among the meek.

“Annexation cannot be defended upon the ground that we shall find a pecuniary profit in the policy. The advantage which may come to a few individuals who hold the offices or who secure valuable franchises cannot properly be weighed against the money expended in governing the Philippines, because the money expended will be paid by those who pay the taxes.

“We are not yet in position to determine whether the people of the United States as a whole will bring back from the Philippines as much as they send there. There is an old saying that it is not profitable to buy a lawsuit. Our nation may learn by experience that it is not wise to purchase the right to conquer a people.

“Spain, under compulsion, gives us a quit-claim to the Philippines in return for \$20,000,000, but she does not agree to warrant and defend our title as against the Filipinos.

“To buy land is one thing; to buy people is another. Land is inanimate and makes no resistance to a transfer of title; the people are animate and sometimes desire a voice in their own affairs. But whether, meas-

ured by dollars and cents, the conquest of the Philippines would prove profitable or expensive, it will certainly prove embarrassing to those who still hold to the doctrine which underlies a republic.

"Military rule is antagonistic to our theory of government. The arguments which are used to defend it in the Philippines may be used to execute it in the United States.

"Under military rule much must be left to the discretion of the Military Governor, and this can only be justified upon the theory that the Governor knows more than the people whom he governs, is better acquainted with their needs than they are themselves, is entirely in sympathy with them, and is thoroughly honest and unselfish in his desire to do them good.

"Such a combination of wisdom, integrity and love is difficult to find and the Republican party will enter upon a hard task when it starts out to select suitable military Governors for our remote possessions.

"Even if the party has absolute confidence in its great political manager, Senator Hanna, it must be remembered that the people of Ohio have compelled him to serve them in the United States Senate, and that inferior men must be intrusted with the distribution of justice and benevolence among the nation's dark-skinned subjects in the Pacific.

"If we enter upon a colonial policy, we must expect to hear the command 'Silence' issuing with increasing emphasis from the imperialists. If a member of Congress attempts to criticise any injustice perpetrated by a government official against a helpless people he will be warned to keep silent lest his criticisms encourage resistance to American authority in the Orient.

"If an orator on the Fourth of July dares to speak of inalienable rights or refers with commendation to the manner in which our forefathers resisted taxation

without representation he will be warned to keep silent lest his utterances excite rebellion among distant subjects.

"If we adopt a colonial policy and pursue the course which incited the revolution of 1776 we must muffle the tones of the old Liberty Bell and commune in whispers when we praise the patriotism of our forefathers.

"We cannot afford to destroy the Declaration of Independence; we cannot afford to erase from our constitutions, State and national, the bill of rights; we have not time to examine the libraries of the nation and purge them of the essays, the speeches, and the books that defend the doctrine that law is the crystallization of public opinion, rather than an emanation from physical power.

"But even if we could destroy every vestige of the laws which are the outgrowth of the immortal document penned by Jefferson; if we could obliterate every written word that has been inspired by the idea that this is 'a government of the people, by the people, and for the people,' we could not tear from the heart of the human race the hope which the American republic has planted there. The impassioned appeal, 'Give me liberty or give me death,' still echoes around the world.

"In the future, as in the past, the desire to be free will be stronger than the desire to enjoy a mere physical existence. The conflict between right and might will continue here and everywhere until a day is reached when the love of money will no longer sear the national conscience and hypocrisy no longer hide the hideous features of avarice behind the mask of philanthropy."

[Extract from speech delivered at Duckworth Club Banquet, Cincinnati, O., January 6, 1899.]



MR. BRYAN PREPARING A POLITICAL SPEECH.

CHESBROUGH



A CORNER IN THE BRYAN PARLOR.

JACKSON DAY SPEECH AT CHICAGO.

“Those who advocate the annexation of the Philippines call themselves expansionists, but they are really imperialists. The word expansion would describe the acquisition of territory to be populated by homogeneous people and to be carved into states like those now in existence. An empire suggests variety in race and diversity in government. The Imperialists do not desire to clothe the Filipinos with all the rights and privileges of American citizenship; they want to exercise sovereignty over an alien race and they expect to rule the new subjects upon a theory entirely at variance with constitutional government. Victoria is Queen of Great Britain and Empress of India; shall we change the title of our executive and call him the President of the United States and Emperor of the Philippines?

“The Democratic party stood for the money of the Constitution in 1896; it stands for the government of the Constitution now.

“It opposed an English financial policy in 1896; it opposes an English colonial policy now. Those who in 1896 were in favor of turning the American people over to the greed of foreign financiers and domestic trusts may now be willing to turn the Filipinos over to the tender mercies of military governors and carpet-bag officials.

“Those who in 1896 thought the people of the United States too weak to attend to their own business may now think them strong enough to attend to the business of remote and alien races; but those who, in 1896, fought for independence for the American people will not now withhold independence from those who desire it elsewhere.

“We are told that the Filipinos are not capable of

self-government; that has a familiar ring. Only two years ago I heard the same argument made against a very respectable minority of the people of this country. The money loaners, who coerced borrowers, did it upon that theory; the employers who coerced their employes did it for the same reason. Self-government is a constant education; the capacity for self-government increases with participation in government. The Filipinos are not far enough advanced to share in the government of the people of the United States, but they are competent to govern themselves. It is not fair to compare them with our own citizens, because the American people have been educating themselves in the science of government for nearly three centuries and, while we have much to learn, we have already made great improvement. The Filipinos will not establish a perfect government, but they will establish a government as nearly perfect as they are competent to enjoy and the United States can protect them from molestation from without.

“Give the Filipinos time and opportunity, and while they never will catch up with us, unless we cease to improve, yet they may some day stand where we stand now.

“What excuse can be given for the adoption of a colonial policy? Secretary Gage disclosed the secret in his Savannah speech. I think we might be justified in calling Mr. Gage the key-hole of the administration, because we look through him to learn what is going on within the executive council chamber. He suggested that ‘philanthropy and five per cent’ would go hand in hand in the new venture. These are the two arguments which are always used in favor of conquest. ‘Philanthropy and five per cent.’ The one chloroforms the conscience of the conqueror and the other picks the pocket of the conquered.

"Some assert that we must hold the islands because of the pecuniary profit to be derived from them, while others say that it is our duty to govern the Filipinos for their own good. I deny the soundness of both arguments. Forcible annexation will not only be 'criminal aggression' (to borrow Mr. McKinley's language of a year ago), but it will cost more than it is worth, and the whole people will pay the cost, while a few will reap all the benefits.

"Still weaker is the argument based upon religious duty. The Christian religion rests upon the doctrine of vicarious suffering; the colonial policy rests upon the doctrine of vicarious enjoyment.

"When the desire to steal becomes uncontrollable in an individual he is declared to be a kleptomaniac and is sent to an asylum; when the desire to grab land becomes uncontrollable in a nation we are told that the 'currents of destiny are flowing through the hearts of men' and that the American people are entering upon 'a manifest mission.'

"Shame upon a logic which locks up the petty offender and enthrones grand larceny. Have the people returned to the worship of the Golden Calf? Have they made unto themselves a new commandment consistent with the spirit of conquest and the lust for empire? Is 'thou shalt not steal upon a small scale' to be substituted for the law of Moses?

"Awake O ancient Law-Giver, awake! Break forth from thine unmarked sepulchre and speed thee back to cloud-crowned Sinai; commune once more with the God of our fathers and proclaim again the words engraven upon the tables of stone—the law that was, the law that is to-day—the law that neither individual nor nation can violate with impunity."

NABOTH'S VINEYARD.

"The Bible tells us that Ahab, the king, wanted the vineyard of Naboth and was sorely grieved because the owner thereof refused to part with the inheritance of his fathers. Then followed a plot, and false charges were preferred against Naboth to furnish an excuse for getting rid of him.

"'Thou shalt not covet!' 'Thou shalt not bear false witness!' 'Thou shalt not kill'—three commandments broken, and still a fourth, 'Thou shalt not steal,' to be broken in order to get a little piece of ground! And what was the result? When the king went forth to take possession Elijah, that brave old prophet of the early days, met him and pronounced against him the sentence of the Almighty: 'In the place where the dogs licked the blood of Naboth shall the dogs lick thy blood, even thine.'

"Neither his own exalted position nor the lowly station of his victim could save him from the avenging hand of outraged justice. His case was tried in a court where neither wealth, nor rank, nor power can shield the transgressor.

"Wars of conquest have their origin in covetousness, and the history of the human race has been written in characters of blood because rulers have looked with longing eyes upon the lands of others.

"Covetousness is prone to seek the aid of false pretence to carry out its plans, but what it cannot secure by persuasion it takes by the sword.

"Senator Teller's amendment to the intervention resolution saved the Cubans from the covetousness of those who are so anxious to secure possession of the island, that they are willing to deny the truth of the

declaration of our own Congress, that 'the people of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free.' "

* * *

"Imperialism might expand the nation's territory, but it would contract the nation's purpose. It is not a step forward toward a broader destiny; it is a step backward, toward the narrow views of kings and emperors.

"Dr. Taylor has aptly expressed it in his 'Creed of the Flag,' when he asks:

'Shall we turn to the old world again
With the penitent prodigal's cry?'

"I answer, never. This republic is not a prodigal son; it has not spent its substance in riotous living. It is not ready to retrace its steps and, with shamed face and trembling voice, solicit an humble place among the servants of royalty. It has not sinned against Heaven, and God grant that the crowned heads of Europe may never have occasion to kill the fatted calf to commemorate its return from reliance upon the will of the people to dependence upon the authority which flows from regal birth or superior force!

"We cannot afford to enter upon a colonial policy. The theory upon which a government is built is a matter of vital importance. The national idea has a controlling influence upon the thought and character of the people. Our national idea is self-government, and unless we are ready to abandon that idea forever we cannot ignore it in dealing with the Filipinos.

"That idea is entwined with our traditions; it permeates our history; it is a part of our literature.

"That idea has given eloquence to the orator and inspiration to the poet. Take from our national hymns

the three words, free, freedom and liberty, and they would be as meaningless as would be our flag if robbed of its red, white and blue.

“Other nations may dream of wars of conquest and of distant dependencies governed by external force; not so with the United States.

“The fruits of imperialism, be they bitter or sweet, must be left to the subjects of monarchy. This is the one tree of which the citizens of a republic may not partake. It is the voice of the serpent, not the voice of God, that bids us eat.”

[Extract from speech delivered in Denver, Colo., January 17, 1899, at the joint invitation of the Chairmen of the Democratic, Populist and Silver Republican State Committees.]

LIBERTY, NOT CONQUEST.

The ratification of the treaty, instead of committing the United States to a colonial policy, really clears the way for the recognition of a Philippine republic. Lincoln, in his first inaugural message, condensed an unanswerable argument into a brief question when he asked, “Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws?” The same argument is presented in the question, Could the independence of the Filipinos be secured more easily by diplomacy from a foreign and hostile nation than it can through laws passed by Congress and voicing the sentiments of the American people alone? If independence is more desirable to our people than a colonial policy who is there or what is there to prevent the recognition of Philippine independence? It is absurd to say that the United States can be transformed from a republic into an empire without consulting the voters.

The imperialists may be willing to deny to the

Filipinos the right to govern themselves, but they cannot deny to the American people the right to determine the policy to be pursued by the United States in the settlement of the Philippine question.

Until the people express themselves we can only guess at their views, but is it not safer to suppose that they will adhere to the ideas and policies of a century than to assume that they will go back to the creed of kings and to the gospel of force?

In commemoration of the fact that France was our ally in securing independence the citizens of that nation joined with the citizens of the United States in placing in New York Harbor an heroic statue representing Liberty enlightening the world. What course shall our nation pursue? Send the statue of Liberty back to France and borrow from England a statue of William the Conqueror? Or shall our nation so act as to enable the American people to join with the Filipinos in placing in the harbor of Manila a statue of Liberty enlightening the Orient?

[Extract from speech delivered at Democratic banquet, St. Paul, Minn., February 14, 1899.]

IT RESTS WITH THE PEOPLE.

“The President, in his Boston speech, has declared that the future of the Philippines is in the hands of the American people. This is all that has been contended for by the opponents of the forcible and permanent annexation of the Philippine Islands. If the matter is in the hands of the American people, then it is a subject for discussion by the American people, and the only question to be considered and decided is whether the permanent retention of the Philippine Islands is desirable. In considering what

is desirable we must consider what is best for the people of the United States, and what is best for the Filipinos. Those who oppose the colonial policy deny that the adoption of such a policy by this nation would be beneficial either to the United States or to the alien race over which our sovereignty would be extended.

"The sooner the question is settled the better. It is putting the cart before the horse to say that the nation cannot reveal its purpose until the Filipinos lay down their arms. If the nation would declare its intention to establish a stable and independent government in the Philippines and then leave that government in the hands of the people of the islands, hostilities would be suspended at once, and further bloodshed would be avoided.

"What would our colonists have thought of a demand upon the part of England that we first lay down our arms and surrender to the king, and then trust to the decision that he would make? Now that the treaty has been ratified and Spain eliminated from the question, the American people are free to take such action as the circumstances require. Shall our nation enter upon a career of conquest and substitute the doctrine of force for the power of example and the influence of counsel?

"Our forefathers fought for independence under a banner upon which was inscribed the motto, 'Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute.' And so those who to-day not only desire American independence, but are willing to encourage the idea of independence and self-government in other races can fight under a banner upon which is inscribed a similar motto: 'Millions for defense, but not one cent for conquest.'

"Some of the advocates of a colonial policy have

sought to lay upon those who opposed the ratification of the treaty the responsibility for the recent bloodshed at Manila. While I believed, and still believe, that it was better to ratify the treaty and make the fight for Philippine independence before the American people rather than through diplomatic negotiations with Spain, I deny that the Senators who opposed ratification were in any way responsible for the commencement of hostilities.

"The responsibility rests, not upon those who opposed the treaty, but upon those who refused to disclose the nation's purpose, and left the Filipinos to believe that their fight against Spain, instead of bringing them independence, had only brought them a change of masters. It was the desire to be independent that led the Filipinos to resist American authority, and their desire for independence was not inspired by any American opposition to the terms of the treaty. It will be remembered that the Filipinos issued a declaration of independence last summer, before the treaty was negotiated. Opposition to the treaty could not have caused a desire for independence which was expressed before the treaty was made. If it was wrong for any one in this country to inspire in other races a desire for self-government, the imperialists cannot confine their reproaches to the living. They must lay the blame upon American statesmen long since dead. Patrick Henry was responsible to some extent, because the sentiments he expressed in his speech have found a lodgment in the hearts of all races.

"Washington must also be blamed, for when he drew his sword in defense of the rights of the colonists, he gave inspiration to all similarly situated. Jefferson was largely to blame, because the Declaration of Independence, the work of his pen, has been

an inspiration to the lovers of liberty in every clime.

“Abraham Lincoln cannot escape his share of blame if those are to be blamed who have aroused among the oppressed a desire for participation in the government under which they live. When the great emancipator delivered his speech at Gettysburg, and appealed to the people of the United States to so act that ‘a government of the people, for the people, and by the people shall not perish from the earth,’ he did more to stimulate the desire for self-government than has been done by any other public man in half a century.

“The American people cannot apply the European and monarchical doctrine of force in the subjugation and government of alien races and at the same time stand forth as defenders of the principles embodied in our Declaration of Independence and Constitution. A man may live a double life when only one of his lives is known, but as soon as his duplicity becomes manifest to the world he can lead but one life, and that the worst. As soon as we establish two forms of government, one by consent in this country and the other by force in Asia, we shall cease to have the influence of a republic and shall join in the spoliation of helpless people under the pretense of conferring upon them unsought and undesired blessings.

“Independence for the Filipinos under a protectorate which will guard them from outside interference while they work out their own destiny is consistent with American tradition, American history, and American interests. The sooner the declaration is made the better.”

[Extract from speech delivered at State University, Ann Arbor, Mich., February 18, 1899.]

AMERICA'S MISSION.

When the advocates of imperialism find it impossible to reconcile a colonial policy with the principles of our government or with the canons of morality; when they are unable to defend it upon the ground of religious duty or pecuniary profit, they fall back in helpless despair upon the assertion that it is destiny. "Suppose it does violate the constitution," they say; "suppose it does break all the commandments; suppose it does entail upon the nation an incalculable expenditure of blood and money; it is destiny and we must submit."

The people have not voted for imperialism; no national convention has declared for it; no Congress has passed upon it. To whom, then, has the future been revealed? Whence this voice of authority? We can all prophesy, but our prophesies are merely guesses, colored by our hopes and our surroundings. Man's opinion of what is to be is half wish and half environment. Avarice paints destiny with a dollar mark before it, militarism equips it with a sword.

He is the best prophet who, recognizing the omnipotence of truth, comprehends most clearly the great forces which are working out the progress, not of one party, not of one nation, but of the human race.

History is replete with predictions which once wore the hue of destiny, but which failed of fulfillment because those who uttered them saw too small an arc of the circle of events. When Pharaoh pursued the fleeing Israelites to the edge of the Red Sea he was confident that their bondage would be renewed and that they would again make bricks without straw, but destiny was not revealed until Moses and his followers reached the farther shore dry shod and the waves

rolled over the horses and chariots of the Egyptians. When Belshazzar, on the last night of his reign, led his thousand lords into the Babylonian banquet hall and sat down to a table glittering with vessels of silver and gold he felt sure of his kingdom for many years to come, but destiny was not revealed until the hand wrote upon the wall those awe-inspiring words, "Mene, Mene, Tekel Upharsin." When Abderrahman swept northward with his conquering hosts his imagination saw the Crescent triumphant throughout the world, but destiny was not revealed until Charles Martel raised the cross above the battlefield of Tours and saved Europe from the sword of Mohammedanism. When Napoleon emerged victorious from Marengo, from Ulm and from Austerlitz he thought himself the child of destiny, but destiny was not revealed until Blücher's forces joined the army of Wellington and the vanquished Corsican began his melancholy march toward St. Helena. When the redcoats of George the Third routed the New Englanders at Lexington and Bunker Hill there arose before the British sovereign visions of colonies taxed without representation and drained of their wealth by foreign-made laws, but destiny was not revealed until the surrender of Cornwallis completed the work begun at Independence Hall and ushered into existence a government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed.

We have reached another crisis. The ancient doctrine of imperialism, banished from our land more than a century ago, has recrossed the Atlantic and challenged democracy to mortal combat upon American soil.

Whether the Spanish war shall be known in history as a war for liberty or as a war of conquest; whether the principles of self-government shall be strength-

ened or abandoned; whether this nation shall remain a homogeneous republic or become a heterogeneous empire—these questions must be answered by the American people—when they speak, and not until then, will destiny be revealed.

Destiny is not a matter of chance, it is a matter of choice; it is not a thing to be waited for, it is a thing to be achieved.

No one can see the end from the beginning, but every one can make his course an honorable one from beginning to end, by adhering to the right under all circumstances. Whether a man steals much or little may depend upon his opportunities, but whether he steals at all depends upon his own volition.

So with our nation. If we embark upon a career of conquest no one can tell how many islands we may be able to seize or how many races we may be able to subjugate; neither can any one estimate the cost, immediate and remote, to the nation's purse and to the nation's character, but whether we shall enter upon such a career is a question which the people have a right to decide for themselves.

Unexpected events may retard or advance the nation's growth, but the nation's purpose determines its destiny.

What is the nation's purpose?

The main purpose of the founders of our government was to secure for themselves and for posterity the blessings of liberty, and that purpose has been faithfully followed up to this time. Our statesmen have opposed each other upon economic questions, but they have agreed in defending self-government as the controlling national idea. They have quarreled among themselves over tariff and finance, but they have been united in their opposition to an entangling alliance with any European power.

Under this policy our nation has grown in numbers and in strength. Under this policy its beneficent influence has encircled the globe. Under this policy the taxpayers have been spared the burden and the menace of a large military establishment and the young men have been taught the arts of peace rather than the science of war. On each returning Fourth of July our people have met to celebrate the signing of the Declaration of Independence; their hearts have renewed their vows to free institutions and their voices have praised the forefathers whose wisdom and courage and patriotism made it possible for each succeeding generation to repeat the words,

"My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of Liberty,
Of thee I sing."

This sentiment was well-nigh universal until a year ago. It was to this sentiment that the Cuban insurgents appealed; it was this sentiment that impelled our people to enter into the war with Spain. Have the people so changed within a few short months that they are now willing to apologize for the War of the Revolution and force upon the Filipinos the same system of government against which the colonists protested with fire and sword?

The hour of temptation has come, but temptations do not destroy, they merely test the strength of individuals and nations; they are stumbling blocks or stepping-stones; they lead to infamy or fame, according to the use made of them.

Benedict Arnold and Ethan Allen served together in the Continental army and both were offered British gold. Arnold yielded to the temptation and made his name a synonym for treason; Allen resisted and lives in the affections of his countrymen.

Our nation is tempted to depart from its "standard

of morality" and adopt a policy of "criminal aggression." But, will it yield?

If I mistake not the sentiment of the American people they will spurn the bribe of imperialism, and, by resisting temptation, win such a victory as has not been won since the battle of Yorktown. Let it be written of the United States: Behold a republic that took up arms to aid a neighboring people, struggling to be free; a republic that, in the progress of the war, helped distant races whose wrongs were not in contemplation when hostilities began; a republic that, when peace was restored, turned a deaf ear to the clamorous voice of greed and to those borne down by the weight of a foreign yoke spoke the welcome words, Stand up; be free—let this be the record made on history's page and the silent example of this republic, true to its principles in the hour of trial, will do more to extend the area of self-government and civilization than could be done by all the wars of conquest that we could wage in a generation.

The forcible annexation of the Philippine Islands is not necessary to make the United States a world-power. For over ten decades our nation has been a world-power. During its brief existence it has exerted upon the human race an influence more potent for good than all the other nations of the earth combined, and it has exerted that influence without the use of sword or Gatling gun. Mexico and the republics of Central and South America testify to the benign influence of our institutions, while Europe and Asia give evidence of the working of the leaven of self-government. In the growth of democracy we observe the triumphant march of an idea—an idea that would be weighted down rather than aided by the armor and weapons proffered by imperialism.

Much has been said of late about Anglo-Saxon

civilization. Far be it from me to detract from the service rendered to the world by the sturdy race whose language we speak. The union of the Angle and the Saxon formed a new and valuable type, but the process of race evolution was not completed when the Angle and the Saxon met. A still later type has appeared which is superior to any which has existed heretofore; and with this new type will come a higher civilization than any which has preceded it. Great has been the Greek, the Latin, the Slavic, the Celt, the Teuton and the Anglo-Saxon, but greater than any of these is the American, in whom are blended the virtues of them all.

Civil and religious liberty, universal education and the right to participate, directly or through representatives chosen by himself, in all the affairs of government—these give to the American citizen an opportunity and an inspiration which can be found nowhere else.

Standing upon the vantage ground already gained the American people can aspire to a grander destiny than has opened before any other race.


Anglo-Saxon civilization has taught the individual to protect his own rights, American civilization will teach him to respect the rights of others.

Anglo-Saxon civilization has taught the individual to take care of himself, American civilization, proclaiming the equality of all before the law, will teach him that his own highest good requires the observance of the commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Anglo-Saxon civilization has, by force of arms, applied the art of government to other races for the benefit of Anglo-Saxons, American civilization will, by the influence of example, excite in other races a



MRS. BRYAN'S FAVORITE OCCUPATION.



MR. BRYAN ON HIS FARM.

desire for self-government and a determination to secure it.

Anglo-Saxon civilization has carried its flag to every clime and defended it with forts and garrisons. American civilization will imprint its flag upon the hearts of all who long for freedom.

To American civilization, all hail!

"Time's noblest offspring is the last!"

[Extract from speech delivered at Washington Day banquet given by the Virginia Democratic Association at Washington, D. C., February 22, 1899.]

CHAPTER II.

ARTICLES WRITTEN BY HON. W. J. BRYAN ON IMPERIALISM.

JEFFERSON VERSUS IMPERIALISM.

The advocates of imperialism have sought to support their position by appealing to the authority of Jefferson. Of all the statesmen who have ever lived, Jefferson was the one most hostile to the doctrines embodied in the demand for a European colonial policy.

Imperialism, as it now presents itself, embraces four distinct propositions:

1. That the acquisition of territory by conquest is right.
2. That the acquisition of remote territory is desirable.
3. That the doctrine that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed is unsound.
4. That people can be wisely governed by aliens.

To all these propositions Jefferson was emphatically opposed. In a letter to William Short, written in 1791, he said:

“If there be one principle more deeply written than any other in the mind of every American, it is that we should have nothing to do with conquest.”

Could he be more explicit? Here we have a clear and strong denunciation of the doctrine that territory should be acquired by force. If it is said that we have outgrown the ideas of the fathers, it may be ob-

served that the doctrine laid down by Jefferson was reiterated only a few years ago by no less a Republican than James G. Blaine. All remember the enthusiasm with which he entered into the work of bringing the Republics of North and South America into close and cordial relations; some, however, may have forgotten the resolutions introduced by him at the conference held in 1890, and approved by the commissioners present. They are as follows:

"First. That the principle of conquest shall not, during the continuance of the treaty of arbitration, be recognized as admissible under American public law.

"Second. That all cessions of territory made during the continuance of the treaty of arbitration shall be void if made under threats of war or in the presence of an armed force.

"Third. Any nation from which such cessions shall be exacted may demand that the validity of the cessions so made shall be submitted to arbitration.

"Fourth. Any renunciation of the right to arbitration made under the conditions named in the second section shall be null and void."

If the principle of conquest is right, why should it be denied a place in American public law? So objectionable is the theory of acquisition of territory by conquest that the nation which suffers such injustice can, according to the resolutions, recover by arbitration the land ceded in the presence of an armed force. So abhorrent is it, that a waiver of arbitration, made under such circumstances, is null and void. While the resolutions were only for the consideration of the American Republics, the principle therein stated cannot be limited by latitude or longitude.

But this is a time of great and rapid changes and some may even look upon Blaine's official acts as an

cient history. If so, let it be remembered that President McKinley only a year ago (December 6, 1897), in a message to Congress discussing the Cuban situation, said:

"I speak not of forcible annexation, for that is not to be thought of. That, by our code of morality, would be criminal aggression."

And yet some are now thinking of that which was then "not to be thought of." Policy may change, but does a "code of morality" change? In his recent speech at Savannah Secretary Gage, in defending the new policy of the administration, suggested that "philanthropy and five per cent" may go hand in hand. Surely we know not what a day may bring forth, if in so short a time "criminal aggression" can be transformed into "philanthropy and five per cent." What beauty, what riches, the isles of the Pacific must possess if they can tempt our people to abandon not only the traditions of a century, but our standard of national morality! What visions of national greatness the Philippines must arouse if the very sight of them can lead our country to vie with the monarchies of the old world in the extension of sovereignty by force.

Jefferson has been called an expansionist, but our opponents will search in vain for a single instance where he advocated the acquisition of remote territory. On the contrary, he expressly disclaimed any desire for land outside of the North American continent. That he looked forward to the annexation of Cuba is well known, but in a letter to President Monroe, dated June 23, 1823, he suggested that we should be in readiness to receive Cuba "when solicited by herself." To him Cuba was desirable only because of the island's close proximity to the United States. Thinking that someone might use the annexation of Cuba as a precedent for indefinite expansion, he said

in a letter to President Madison, dated April 27, 1809:

"It will be objected to our receiving Cuba that no limit can then be drawn to our future acquisitions," but, he added, "Cuba can be defended by us without a navy, and this develops the principle which ought to limit our views. Nothing should ever be accepted which would require a navy to defend it."

In the same letter, speaking of the possible acquisition of that island, he said:

"I would immediately erect a column on the southernmost limit of Cuba, and inscribe on it a *ne plus ultra* as to us in that direction."

It may be argued that Jefferson was wrong in asserting that we should confine our possessions to the North American continent, but certainly no one can truthfully quote him as an authority for excursions into the eastern hemisphere. If he was unwilling to go farther south than Cuba, even in the western hemisphere, would he be likely to look with favor upon colonies in the Orient?

If the authority of Jefferson cannot be invoked to support the acquisition of remote territory, much less can his great name be used to excuse a colonial policy which denies to the people the right to govern themselves. When he suggested an inscription for his monument he did not enumerate the honors which he had received, though no American had been more highly honored; he only asked to be remembered for what he had done and he named the writing of the Declaration of Independence as the greatest of his deeds. In that memorable document he declared it a self-evident truth that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. The defense and development of that doctrine was his special care. His writings abound with expressions showing his devotion to that doctrine and his solici-

tude for it. He preached it in the enthusiasm of his youth; he reiterated it when he reached the age of maturity; he crowned it with benedictions in his old age. Who will say that, if living, he would jeopardize it to-day by engrafting upon it the doctrine of government by external force.

Upon the fourth proposition Jefferson is no less explicit. Now, when some are suggesting the wisdom of a military government for the Philippines, or a colonial system such as England administers in India, it will not be out of place to refer to the manner in which Jefferson viewed the inability of aliens to prescribe laws and administer government. In 1817 a French society was formed for the purpose of settling upon a tract of land near the Tombigbee River. Jefferson was invited to formulate laws and regulations for the society. On the 16th of January of that year he wrote from Monticello expressing his high appreciation of the confidence expressed in him, but declining to undertake the task. The reasons he gave are well worth considering at this time. After wishing them great happiness in their undertaking he said:

“The laws, however, which must effect this must flow from their own habits, their own feelings, and the resources of their own minds. No stranger to these could possibly propose regulations adapted to them. Every people have their own particular habits, ways of thinking, manners, etc., which have grown up with them from their infancy, are become a part of their nature, and to which the regulations which are to make them happy must be accommodated. No member of a foreign country can have a sufficient sympathy with these. The institutions of Lycurgus, for example, would not have suited Athens, nor those of Solon, Lacedæmon. The organizations of Locke

were impracticable for Carolina, and those of Rosseau for Poland. Turning inwardly on myself from these eminent illustrations of the truth of my observation, I feel all the presumption it would manifest should I undertake to do what this respectable society is alone qualified to do suitably for itself."

The alien may possess greater intelligence and greater strength, but he lacks the sympathy for, and the identification with, the people. We have only to recall the grievances enumerated in the Declaration of Independence to learn how an ocean may dilute justice and how the cry of the oppressed can be silenced by distance. And yet the inhabitants of the colonies were the descendants of Englishmen—blood of their blood and bone of their bone. Shall we be more considerate of subjects farther away from us, and differing from us in color, race and tongue, than the English were of their own offspring?

Modest Jefferson!—he had been Governor, Ambassador to France, Vice-President and President; he was ripe in experience and crowned with honors; but this modern lawgiver, this immortal genius, hesitated to suggest laws for a people with whose habits, customs and methods of thought he was unfamiliar. And yet the imperialists of to-day, intoxicated by a taste of blood, are rash enough to enter upon the government of the Filipinos, confident of the nation's ability to compel obedience, even if it cannot earn gratitude or win affection. Plutarch said that men entertained three sentiments concerning the ancient gods: They feared them for their strength, admired them for their wisdom, and loved them for their justice. Jefferson taught the doctrine that governments should win the love of men. What shall be the ambition of our nation; to be loved because it is just or to be feared because it is strong?

THE ARMY.

In his annual message sent to Congress December 5, 1898, the President makes the following recommendations in favor of a permanent increase in the standing army:

"The importance of legislation for the permanent increase of the army is therefore manifest, and the recommendation of the Secretary of War for that purpose has my unqualified approval. There can be no question that at this time, and probably for some time in the future, one hundred thousand men will be none too many to meet the necessities of the situation."

It is strange that this request for so large an increase in the permanent army should be asked of a peace-loving people just at the time when the Czar of Russia is urging the nations of the world to join in the reduction of military establishments. But, strange as it may seem, the President not only requests it, but the Republican leaders in Congress seem inclined to grant the request.

Progress in Europe; retrogression in the United States!

In the old world "the currents of destiny" seem to be running in the direction of relief to the people from military burdens; shall they run in an opposite direction here?

During the recent campaign the people were urged to support the party in power until the "fruits of victory" could be made secure. Is the first fruit of victory to be realized in the transfer of a large body of men from the field and workshop to the camp and barracks—from the ranks of the wealth producers to the ranks of the tax consumers? Such a transfer

will lessen the nation's wealth-producing power and at the same time exact a larger annual tribute from those who toil.

Any unnecessary increase in the regular army is open to several objections, among which may be mentioned the following:

First—It increases taxes, and thus does injustice to those who contribute to the support of the Government.

Second—It tends to place force above reason in the structure of our Government.

Third—It lessens the nation's dependence upon its citizen soldiery—the sheet-anchor of a republic's defense.

No one objects to the maintenance of a regular army sufficient in strength to maintain law and order in time of peace and to form the nucleus of such an army as may be required when the military establishment is placed upon a war footing; but the taxpayers are justified in entering a vigorous protest against excessive appropriations for military purposes.

It is not surprising that the protest is most vigorous from the masses, because under our system of taxation the bulk of our Federal revenues is collected from import duties and internal revenue taxes upon liquors and tobaccos, all of which bear most heavily upon the poor. Import duties are collected upon articles used by the people, and the people do not use the articles taxed in proportion to income.

For instance, a man with an income of \$100,000 does not eat, nor wear, nor use a hundred times as much of articles taxed as the average man with an income of \$1,000. The people with small incomes, therefore, pay, as a rule, a larger percentage of their incomes to support the Federal Government than people with large incomes. The same is true of in-

ternal revenue taxes collected upon liquors and tobaccos. Men do not use liquor and tobacco in proportion to their incomes. Thus it will be seen that our Federal taxes are, in effect, an income tax; not only an income tax, but a graded income tax, and heaviest in proportion upon the smallest incomes.

If we could supply a part of our necessary revenues from a direct income tax the burdens of a large army would be more equitably borne, but, according to the decision of the Supreme Court, the income of an individual is more sacred than the individual, because the citizen can be drafted in time of danger, while his income cannot be taxed either in peace or war.

The army is the impersonation of force. It does not deliberate, it acts; it does not decide, it executes; it does not reason, it shoots.

Militarism is the very antithesis of Democracy; they do not grow in the same soil; they do not draw their nourishment from the same source.

In an army orders come down from the commander to the soldier, and the soldier obeys; in a republic mandates issue from the sovereign people, and the public servant gives heed. If any one doubts the demoralizing results which follow the use of force, even when that force is justified by necessity, let him behold the change which has taken place in the views of many of our people during the last eight months and then estimate, if he can, the far-reaching effect which a large increase in the permanent army would have upon the thoughts, the purposes and the character of our people.

Our Government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, and its strength from the people themselves. We cannot afford to weaken the Government's reliance upon the people by cultivating the idea that all the work of war must be done by pro-

fessional soldiers. The citizen is a safer lawmaker when he may be called upon to assist in the enforcement of the laws, and legislation is more likely to be just when the Government relies largely upon volunteers, because the support is surest when the Government is so beneficent that each citizen is willing to die to preserve its blessings to posterity. The readiness with which the American people have always responded to their country's call is a guarantee as to the future.

I have suggested some of the reasons (not all, by any means) why the regular army should not be increased, unless such increase be actually necessary. I now ask whether there is any such necessity for increasing that branch of the army which is held for service in the United States. There may, from time to time, be need of small additions to man new coast fortifications; but what is there in the domestic situation to justify or excuse the demand for more soldiers?

An army of occupation for service in Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines is made necessary by the conditions growing out of the war. But such an army is temporary in character, and should not be made a pretext for an increase of 200 per cent in our standing army.

The President assures us, in his last message, that the only purpose our Government has in taking possession of Cuba is to assist the Cubans in establishing a stable government. When that is accomplished our troops are to be withdrawn.

The number needed in the Philippines will depend largely upon the course pursued by the Government in regard to those islands. It will require fewer soldiers and less time to give self-government to the inhabitants of the Philippines than it will to give them a military government or a "carpet-bag" government

Since our standing army was sufficient for all domestic purposes prior to the war, and since there is much uncertainty in regard to the army of occupation, it would seem the part of wisdom to separate the two branches of the service and make provision at once for the latter, leaving the friends and opponents of a large standing army to settle that question after the volunteers are mustered out.

Most of the volunteers have no taste for military life; they left peaceful pursuits and enlisted, at a great sacrifice to themselves and their relatives, because their country needed them. Now that the war is over they desire to return home, and their desire should be gratified at the earliest possible moment. They were willing to fight when fighting was necessary; they were ready to lay down their arms as soon as hostilities ceased. If an attempt be made to secure a large increase in the army at home, merely because of a temporary need for an insular army, a prolonged Congressional debate is inevitable. Is it fair to keep the volunteers in the service while this question is being disposed of?

Unless Republican leaders desire to hold the volunteers as hostages to compel Congress to consent to a large army, they ought to be willing to postpone the consideration of the Regular Army bill and accept a substitute authorizing the President to recruit an army of occupation for service outside of the United States. The soldiers can be enlisted for two or three years, and before their term expires the nation's policy will be defined and conditions so settled that provision can be made for the future with more intelligence.

In recruiting the army of occupation opportunity should be given for the re-enlistment of such volunteers as desire to continue in the service. And I may add that it will encourage re-enlistment if a company

or battalion formed from a volunteer regiment is allowed to select its officers from among the members of the regiment.

The pay of enlisted men serving in the army of occupation should be considerably increased over the present rate to compensate for greater risk to health incurred in the islands.

When the time arrives for the deliberate consideration of the permanent military establishment it will be found safer and more economical to provide complete modern equipment for the State militia, together with liberal appropriations for instruction and for annual encampments, than to increase the regular army. Soldiers in the regular service are withdrawn from productive labor and must be supported the year around, while members of the State militia receive military training without abandoning civil pursuits and without becoming a pecuniary burden to either State or nation.

To recapitulate: There is no immediate necessity for the consideration of the proposition to permanently increase the military establishment; there is immediate necessity for the relief of the volunteers.

Let the army of occupation be recruited at once; let the size of the regular army be determined after the volunteers have been released.

The people are united in the desire to muster out the volunteers; they are divided in opinion in regard to the regular army.

Let each question be decided upon its merits.

RATIFY THE TREATY. DECLARE THE NATION'S
POLICY.

I gladly avail myself of the columns of the Journal to suggest a few reasons why the opponents of a colonial policy should make their fight in support of a resolution declaring the nation's purpose rather than against the ratification of the treaty.

The conflict between the doctrine of self-government and the doctrine of alien government supported by external force has been thrust upon the American people as a result of the war. It is so important a conflict that it cannot be avoided, and, since it deals with a question now before Congress, it must be considered immediately. It is useless to ask what effect this new issue will have upon other issues. Issues must be met as they arise; they cannot be moved about at will like pawns upon a chess board.

The opponents of imperialism have an opportunity to choose the ground upon which the battle is to be fought. Why not oppose the ratification of the treaty?

First, because a victory won against the treaty would prove only temporary if the people really favor a colonial policy.

That a victory won against the treaty would depend for its value entirely upon the sentiment of the people is evident. A minority can obstruct action for a time, but a minority, so long as it remains a minority, can only delay action and enforce reflection; it cannot commit the nation to a policy.

When there seemed some probability of the rejection of the treaty the friends of the administration began to suggest the propriety of withholding the treaty until the new senate could be convened in extra ses-

sion. As the new senate will have a considerable Republican majority it would be quite certain to ratify the treaty. Thus an effort to prevent the ratification of the treaty would be likely to fail in the very beginning. But let us suppose it possible to defeat ratification in both the present and the next senate—what would be the result? Would the imperialists abandon the hope of annexing the Philippines so long as they could claim the support of the President and a majority of both houses? Could a minority of the Senate prevent the annexation of Hawaii? As we are now in possession of the Philippine Islands the advocates of a colonial policy might secure an appropriation sufficient to pay the twenty millions agreed upon and leave the rest of the treaty for future consideration. In other words, if the opponents of imperialism have a majority in both houses they can declare the nation's policy; if the imperialists have a majority in both houses they cannot be permanently thwarted by a minority in the Senate.

A resolution declaring the nation's policy recognizes that the destiny of the United States is in the hands of all the people and seeks to ascertain at once the sentiment of the people as reflected by their representatives.

If that decision is in harmony with the policy which has prevailed in the past the question will be settled and the people will return to the consideration of domestic problems. If, however, the advocates of imperialism either postpone consideration or control the action of Congress an appeal will be taken to the voters at the next election. So great a change in our national policy cannot be made unless the authority therefor comes directly and unequivocally from that source of all power in a republic—the people.

In answer to those who fear that the question of

imperialism, if discussed, will draw attention away from other questions, it is sufficient to say that the people cannot be prevented from considering a question which reaches down to the foundation principles of the republic. Instead of avoiding the issue it is the part of wisdom to deal with it at once and dispose of it permanently.

Second, the rejection of the treaty would be unwise because the opponents of the treaty would be compelled to assume responsibility for the continuance of war conditions and for the risks which always attend negotiations with a hostile nation.

The rejection of the treaty would give the administration an excuse for military expenditures which could not be justified after the conclusion of peace, and the opponents of the treaty would be charged with making such appropriations necessary. It must be remembered that in case the treaty is rejected negotiations must be renewed with an enemy whose ill-will is not concealed. Who is able to guarantee the nation against new dangers and new complications? In order to form an estimate of the risks which would thus be incurred, one has only to recall the unexpected things which have happened since war was declared. Is it wise to so make the attack as to assume all the risks when the same end can be gained by a plan which throws the risks upon our opponents? If the imperialists vote down a resolution declaring the nation's policy or postpone its consideration, they become responsible for any loss of life or expenditure of money which may follow as a result of such action.

I suggest below a few reasons in support of a resolution declaring it to be the nation's purpose to establish a stable government in Cuba and the Philippines and then to give the inhabitants independence under



HARD AT WORK.



MR. BRYAN'S BUST CARRIED INTO CONVENTION HALL.

an American protectorate which will guard them against molestation from without.

First, such a course is consistent with national honor.

Our nation owes it to the nations with which we have dealings, as well as to the inhabitants of Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines, to announce immediately what it intends to do respecting the territory surrendered by Spain.

The President has said that the only purpose our nation has in taking possession of Cuba is to assist the inhabitants to establish a stable and independent government. It can do no harm for Congress to reaffirm this purpose, and it may do much good. The Cubans, having fought for independence for many years and against great odds, are naturally jealous of the liberty which they have won and no doubt should be left as to the sincerity and good faith of our government in its dealings with them. Such a declaration would not only be harmless, but it is almost made necessary by the flippant, if not contemptuous, tone in which some United States officials speak of the intelligence and patriotism of the Cubans and of their right to independence.

The duty of declaring our national policy in regard to the Philippines is even more imperative. The Filipinos were fighting for independence when the United States declared war against Spain. In the formal protest filed with the peace commissioners in Paris the representatives of Aguinaldo assert that they received friendly assurances from United States officials and acted upon those assurances in co-operating against the Spaniards. Whether or not such assurances were given, frankness and honesty should characterize our dealings with them.

If we announce to the world that we hold the Phil-

ippine Islands, not for pecuniary profit but in trust for the inhabitants; if we declare that our only purpose is to assist the Filipinos to establish a stable and independent government, friendly relations will be maintained and there will be little need of troops. If, on the other hand, the Filipinos are not to have independence but merely a change of masters we should break the news to them at once and send over a large army to instruct them in the principles of a government which, in one hemisphere, derives its just powers from the consent of the governed and in the other derives its authority from superior force.

While our nation is not prepared to draft a complete code of laws suited to the peculiar needs of the Filipinos we ought to be able to decide at once whether we intend to deal with them according to the principles of our own government or according to the customs prevailing among European monarchies. Even a republican Congress ought to be able to choose without hesitation between a policy which establishes a republic in the Orient and a policy which sows the seeds of militarism in the United States.

The trade relations possible under a protectorate would be of more value to the United States than any which could come as the result of forcible annexation.

The people of Porto Rico have not manifested any desire for political independence and would in all probability favor annexation, yet it is only right that they should have an opportunity to choose. The resolution authorizing intervention recognized the right of the Cubans to independence. To be consistent we must also respect the wishes of the inhabitants of Porto Rico. The resolution could, without impropriety, offer annexation to Porto Rico.

In a recent interview I suggested that the United

States should retain a harbor and coaling station in the Philippines and in Porto Rico in return for services rendered and added that Cuba should be asked to make a similar concession on the same ground.

Second, a resolution declaring the nation's purpose presents a plain and clear-cut issue between the theory of self-government and the colonial policy. It presents a positive affirmative method of dealing with the question. In opposing the treaty we would be on the defensive; in outlining a policy we shall be aggressive. The strongest arguments which could be used in support of the treaty will lose their force entirely when Spain is eliminated and the American people are able to dispose of the question according to their own ideas and interests.

Third, it secures, by easier means, every end that can be secured by a rejection of the treaty.

If an officer of the law arrests a person in possession of stolen goods he can either compel the return of the goods to the owner or he can first rescue them and then return them himself. We find Spain in the possession of a title to a part of the Philippines. She has not yet conquered all the native tribes, but the title which she has was acquired by force and has been held by force. We can either compel her to surrender her title to the Filipinos, as we compelled her to surrender Cuba to the Cubans, or we can accept possession and then of our own accord turn over the islands to the inhabitants. The peace commissioners might have demanded independence for the Filipinos as they did for the Cubans; if they did not properly interpret the wishes of the people of the United States the blame must fall upon them and not upon the people. Certainly seventy millions of citizens are under no obligation to abate their devotion to the ideals which they have cherished for a century in order to

endorse the work of a peace commission or to approve of the instructions of an executive.

If it is urged that the ratification of the treaty imposes upon us an obligation to pay twenty millions of dollars to Spain, I answer, first, that this amount can probably be secured from the Filipinos in return for independence, and second, that, if it cannot be secured from them, it is better to lose the amount entirely than to expend a larger sum in securing a modification of the treaty.

It is better to regard the amount paid as a contribution to liberty than to consider it the market price of land, improvements or people.

To terminate the war upon the same high plane upon which it was inaugurated is worthy of a great republic; to descend from a sublime beginning to the purchase of sovereignty (for our own profit) from a nation whose title we disputed in Cuba would lay us open to the charge of Punic faith.

WILL IT PAY?

On former occasions I have quoted authority against the policy of imperialism and have insisted that the adoption of an European colonial policy would endanger the perpetuity of the republic. While every lover of his country should be willing to surrender a pecuniary advantage, however alluring, if that advantage would in the least jeopardize our national existence, still the opponents of imperialism are fortunate in having upon their side the dollar argument as well as the arguments based upon fundamental principles.

The forcible annexation of the Philippine Islands (and, in my judgment, even annexation by the consent of the people) would prove a source of pecuniary loss rather than gain. Heretofore our acquisitions have been confined to the North American continent, the nation having in view either security from attack or land suitable for settlement. Generally both objects have been realized. Florida and the territory between the Mississippi and the Pacific were necessary for purposes of defense, and, in addition thereto, furnished homes and occupation for an increasing population.

The Hawaiian Islands are nearer to the western than to the eastern hemisphere, and their annexation was urged largely upon the ground that their possession by another nation would be a menace to the United States. When objection was made to the heterogeneous character of the people of the islands, it was met by the assertion that they were few in number. In the opinion of those who favored the annexation of Hawaii the advantages to be gained from a strategical standpoint outweighed the objection raised to the population. No argument made in favor of the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands can be used in support of the imperialistic policy. The purchase of Alaska removed one more monarchy from American territory and gave to the United States a maximum of land with a minimum of inhabitants.

In the forcible annexation of the Philippines our nation neither adds to its strength nor secures broader opportunities for the American people.

Even if the principle of conquest were permissible under American public law, the conquest of territory so remote from our shores, inhabited by people who have no sympathy with our history or our customs, and who resent our attempt to overthrow their declar-

ation of independence, would be a tax upon our military and naval strength the magnitude of which cannot now be determined.

Who can estimate in money and men the cost of subduing and keeping in subjection eight millions of people, six thousand miles away, scattered over twelve hundred islands and living under a tropical sun?

How many soldiers did Spain sacrifice in her effort to put down almost continuous insurrection in Cuba? How many perished from wounds and disease in the vain attempt to keep the Pearl of the Antilles under Spanish dominion? Yet Cuba has only about a million and a half of inhabitants, and Havana is only half as far from Cadiz as Manila is from San Francisco.

If this question is to be settled upon the basis of dollars and cents, who will insure the nation that the receipts will equal the expenditures? Who will guarantee that the income from the Philippines, be it great or small, will find its way back to the pockets of the people who, through taxation, will furnish the money?

And even if the amount invested in ships, armament and in the equipment of soldiers is returned dollar for dollar, who will place a price upon the blood that will be shed? If war is to be waged for trade, how much trade ought to be demanded in exchange for a human life? And will the man who expects to secure the trade risk his own life or the life of some one else?

The demand for a standing army of one hundred thousand men is the beginning of a policy which will increase the hours of toil and fill the homes of the land with vacant chairs.

In his essay on *The West Indies*, Lord Macaulay denies that colonies are a source of profit even to European countries. He says:

"There are some who assert that, in a military and political point of view, the West Indies are of great

importance to this country. This is a common but a monstrous misrepresentation. We venture to say that colonial empire has been one of the greatest curses of modern Europe. What nation has it ever strengthened? What nation has it ever enriched? What have been its fruits? Wars of frequent occurrence and immense cost, fettered trade, lavish expenditure, clashing jurisdiction, corruption in governments and indigence among the people. What have Mexico and Peru done for Spain, the Brazils for Portugal, Batavia for Holland? Or, if the experience of others is lost upon us, shall we not profit by our own? What have we not sacrificed to our infatuated passion for transatlantic dominion? This it is that has so often led us to risk our own smiling gardens and dear firesides for some snowy desert or infectious morass on the other side of the globe; this induced us to resign all the advantages of our insular situation—to embroil ourselves in the intrigues, and fight the battles of half the continent—to form coalitions which were instantly broken—and to give subsidies which were never earned; this gave birth to the fratricidal war against American liberty, with all its disgraceful defeats, and all its barren victories, and all the massacres of the Indian hatchet, and all the bloody contracts of the Hessian slaughter-house; this it was which, in the war against the French republic, induced us to send thousands and tens of thousands of our bravest troops to die in West Indian hospitals, while the armies of our enemies were pouring over the Rhine and the Alps. When a colonial acquisition has been in prospect, we have thought no expenditure extravagant, no interference perilous. Gold has been to us as dust, and blood as water. Shall we never learn wisdom? Shall we never cease to prosecute a pursuit wilder than the wildest dream of alchemy, with

all the credulity and all the profusion of Sir Epicure Mammon?

"Those who maintain that settlements so remote conduce to the military or maritime power of nations fly in the face of history."

Thus wrote England's orator, statesman and historian.

Shall we refuse to profit by the experience of others? Has the victory of seventy millions of people over seventeen millions so infatuated us with our own prowess that gold is to become to us also as dust and blood as water?

Let us consider for a moment the indirect cost of annexation. Grave domestic problems press for solution; can we afford to neglect them in order to engage unnecessarily in controversies abroad?

Must the people at large busy themselves with the contemplation of "destiny" while the special interests hedge themselves about with legal bulwarks and exact an increasing toll from productive industry?

While the American people are endeavoring to extend an unsolicited sovereignty over remote peoples, foreign financiers will be able to complete the conquest of our own country. Labor's protest against the black list and government by injunction and its plea for arbitration, shorter hours and a fair share of the wealth which it creates, will be drowned in noisy disputes over new boundary lines and in the clash of conflicting authority.

Monopoly can thrive in security so long as the inquiry, "Who will haul down the flag," on distant islands turns public attention away from the question, who will uproot the trusts at home?

What will it cost the people to substitute contests over treaties for economic issues? What will it cost the people to postpone consideration of remedial legis-

lation while the ship of state tosses about in the whirlpool of international politics?

In considering the question of imperialism we have a right to weigh possibilities as well as certainties; and among the possibilities may be mentioned an offensive and defensive union between the United States and one or more European nations. Already one may hear an Anglo-American alliance suggested—a suggestion which would have been discarded as a dream a year ago. When this nation abandons its traditions and enters upon a colonial policy, a long step will have been taken toward those entanglements against which Washington and Jefferson with equal emphasis warned their countrymen.

What a change the imperialistic idea has already wrought in the minds of its advocates! During the nation's infancy and development the American people spurned the thought of foreign alliance and its attendant obligations; they refused to yoke the young republic with a monarchy. The wisest among us are not able to measure the cost of a policy which would surrender the nation's independence of action and drag it into the broils of Europe and Asia.

The Monroe Doctrine, too, what will become of it? How can we expect European nations to respect our supremacy in the western hemisphere if we insist upon entering Asia? So long as we confine ourselves to our own continent we are strong enough to repel the world, but are we prepared (or is it worth while to prepare) to wage an offensive warfare in other parts of the globe?

On the other hand, what advantages are suggested by imperialists to offset the cost and dangers mentioned?

They tell us that trade follows the flag and that wider markets will be the result of annexation. With-

out admitting that any argument based upon trade advantages can justify an attempt to adopt a double standard in government—a government by consent in America and a government by force in Asia—it may be answered that commerce is a matter of cost and not a matter of bunting. The protectionist understands this and demands not a flag barrier but a price barrier between the home manufacturer and the foreign competitor.

Public attention has already been called to the fact that, while Spain was sending soldiers to the Philippines England was sending merchandise. While the home government was sending money to the islands Great Britain was drawing money from them.

The cost of transportation is an important factor and has more influence than sovereignty in directing the course of trade.

Canada does not refuse to deal with us merely because she flies the British Jack; in fact, I have been told that she sometimes buys even her British Jacks in the United States. Our foreign trade is increasing, and that increase is not due to an expanding sovereignty.

The insignificance of the trade argument will be manifest to any one who will compare the consuming capacity of the Filipinos with that of a like number of Americans. The inhabitants of the torrid zones can never equal, or even approach, the inhabitants of the temperate zones as customers. England's commerce with the United States is greater than her commerce with India, and yet India has a population of nearly three hundred millions and the English flag floats over them.

It is yet to be decided whether the open door policy will be adopted in the Orient or a tariff wall built around our subjects there, but neither plan will be

found satisfactory. Our people, however, should not expect a colonial policy to prove acceptable, either to the governed or to the governing. If we attempt to run our country upon the European plan we must prepare ourselves for continual complaint. History has thus far failed to furnish a single example of a nation selfish enough to desire a colony and yet unselfish enough to govern it wisely at long range.

It has been argued that annexation would furnish a new field for the investment of American capital. If there is surplus money seeking investment why is it not employed in the purchase of farm lands, in developing domestic enterprises or in replacing foreign capital? In 1896 we were told that we were dependent upon foreign capital and must so legislate as to keep what we had and invite more. Strange that it should be necessary to have an English financial system in order to bring European capital into the States and also an English colonial policy for the purpose of taking American capital out. Every dollar sent to the Philippines must be withdrawn from present investments, and we must either suffer to the extent of the amount withdrawn or borrow abroad and increase our bondage to foreign money lenders.

It is sometimes suggested that the Philippines would furnish homes for those who are crowded out of this country. This argument, too, is without foundation. The population of the United States amounts to only twenty-one persons to the square mile, while the Philippine Islands already contain about sixty to the square mile. It will be several generations before the population of the United States will be as dense as it is now in the Philippines.

Our people will not flock to Manila; climatic conditions will be as great an obstacle as over-population. English supremacy in India has continued for nearly

a hundred and fifty years, and yet in 1891 the British-born population of India was only 100,551—less than the total number of prisoners confined in the jails of India at the end of 1895.

Jamaica has had all the advantages which could be derived from an English colonial policy and yet the white population in 1891 numbered less than fifteen thousand out of a total of 639,000.

Java has been under the dominion of the Netherlands for nearly three hundred years, and yet in 1894 the Europeans upon the island numbered less than 60,000 out of a total population of more than 25,000,000.

Spain has been able to induce but a small number of her people to settle in the Philippines and, if we can judge from the reports sent back by our volunteers, we shall not succeed any better.

But while the Philippines will not prove inviting to Americans, we shall probably draw a considerable number from the islands to the United States. The emigration will be eastward rather than westward. During the six years from 1889 to 1894 more than ninety thousand coolies left India, and we may expect an influx of Malays.

It is not strange that the laboring men should look with undisguised alarm upon the prospect of oriental competition upon the farms and in the factories of the United States. Our people have legislated against Chinese emigration, but to exclude a few Chinese and admit many Filipinos is like straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

The farmers and laboring men constitute a large majority of the American people; what is there in annexation for them? Heavier taxes, Asiatic emigra-

tion and an opportunity to furnish more sons for the army.

Will it pay?

BRITISH RULE IN INDIA.

In the discussion of a colonial policy for the United States frequent references will be made to England's government of India. The imperialists are already declaring that Great Britain's policy has resulted in profit to herself and benefit to her Asiatic subjects.

The opponents of imperialism, on the other hand, find in India's experience a warning against a policy which places one nation under the control of another and distant nation.

In 1600 the first East India company was organized. Its charter was for fifteen years, but a new and perpetual charter was granted in 1609. Under the reign of Charles II. the company obtained another charter which continued former privileges and added authority "to make peace or war with any prince or people (in India) not being Christian."

The affairs of the company were managed with an eye single to gain, and intervention in the quarrels of native princes resulted in the gradual extension of its influence. Money was the object, and the means employed would not always bear scrutiny. There was, however, no hypocritical mingling of an imaginary "philanthropy" with an actual "five per cent."

In 1757 Lord Clive, by the battle of Plassey, made the company the dominant power in Indian politics, and under Clive and Hastings the income of the East India Company reached enormous proportions.

The history of the century, beginning with the bat-

tle of Plassey and ending with the Sepoy mutiny in 1857, was written under headlines like the following: "The First War with Hyder Ali," "The Rohilla War," "The Second War with Hyder Ali," "The War with Tippoo Saib," "The War with the Mahrattas," "Suppression of the Pindaris," "The Last of the Peshwas," "The First Burmese War," "The First Afghan War," "The Conquest of Scinde," "The Sekh Wars," "The Conquest of Punjab," "The Annexation of Pegu," "The Annexation of Oudh," "The Outbreak of Meerut," "The Seizure of Delhi," "The Siege of Lucknow," etc., etc.

This brief review is not given because it is interesting, but to acquaint the reader with the imperialistic plan of solving the problem of civilization by the elimination of unruly factors.

In 1858 Parliament, by an act entitled an act "for the better government of India," confessed that the management of Indian affairs could be improved and placed the control in the hands of a Secretary of State for India and a Council.

In 1877 Queen Victoria assumed the title, Empress of India.

Even if it could be shown that England's sovereignty over India had brought blessings to the Indian people and advantage to the inhabitants of Great Britain, we could not afford to adopt the policy. A monarchy can engage in work which a republic dare not undertake. A monarchy is constructed upon the theory that authority descends from the king and that privileges are granted by the crown to the subjects. Of course the ruling power recognizes that it owes a duty to the people, but while the obligation is binding upon the conscience of the sovereign it cannot be enforced by the subject.

Webster presented this idea with great force in his

speech on the Greek revolution. After setting forth the agreement between the Allied Powers, he said: "The first of these principles is, that all popular or constitutional rights are holden no otherwise than as grants from the crown. Society, upon this principle, has no rights of its own; it takes good government, when it gets it, as a boon and a concession, but can demand nothing. It is to live in that favor which emanates from royal authority, and if it have the misfortune to lose that favor, there is nothing to protect it against any degree of injustice and oppression. It can rightfully make no endeavor for a change, by itself; its whole privilege is to receive the favors that may be dispensed by the sovereign power, and all its duty is described in the single word, submission. This is the plain result of the principal continental state papers; indeed, it is nearly the identical text of some of them."

The English people have from time to time forced the crown to recognize certain rights, but the principle of monarchy still exists. The sovereign has a veto upon all legislation; the fact that this veto has not been used of late does not change the governmental theory and, in India, the application of the theory has deprived the Indian people of participation in the control of their own affairs.


A nation which denies the principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed can give self-government to one colony and deny it to another; it can give it to colonies strong enough to exact it by force and deny it to weaker ones; but a nation which recognizes the people as the only sovereigns, and regards those temporarily in authority merely as public servants, is not at liberty to apply the principle to one section of the country and refuse it to another.

But, so far from supporting the contention of the imperialists, British rule in India really enforces every argument that can be made against a colonial system of government. In the first place, to authorize a commercial company "to make peace or war with any prince or people (not Christian)," according to its pleasure, was to place the pecuniary interests of a few stockholders above the rights of those with whom they had dealings. Clive and Hastings seem to have acted upon this authority. When the former was called to account he confessed that he had forged a treaty and his conduct was such that Parliament was compelled to vote that he "had abused his powers and set an evil example to the servants of the public," but, as he had increased the power of England in India, his condemnation was accompanied by the declaration that he had, "at the same time, rendered great and meritorious services to his country."

The prosecution of Hastings for wrongs inflicted upon the people of India occupies a conspicuous place among the political trials of history. The speeches made against him recall the orations of Cicero against Verres, who, by the way, was also charged with plundering a colony.

Cicero said that Verres relied for his hope of escape upon his ability to corrupt the judges of his day, and it appears that the East India Company was also accused of polluting the stream of justice only a century ago.

In his speech on the Nabob of Arcot's debts, Burke said: "Let no man hereafter talk of the decaying energies of nature. All the acts and monuments in the records of peculation; the consolidated corruption of ages; the pattern of exemplary plunder in the heroic times of Roman iniquity, never equalled the gigantic corruption of this single act. Never did Nero, in all



EXECUTIVE MEMBERS OF CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE IN PRIVATE SESSION.



MR. BRYAN'S BUST UNVEILED AMID GREAT ENTHUSIASM.

the insolent prodigality of despotism, deal out to his prætorian guards a donation fit to be named with the largess showered down by the bounty of our chancellor of the exchequer on the faithful band of his Indian sepoy."

How little human nature changes from age to age! How weak is the boasted strength of the arm of the law when the defendant possesses the influence purchased by great wealth, however obtained, and the accusation comes from a far-off victim of oppression!

Those who expect justice to be exercised by officials far removed from the source of power—officials who do not receive their commissions from, and cannot be removed by, the people whom they govern—should read Sheridan's great speech portraying the effect of the Hastings policy upon the people of India.

Below will be found an extract:

"If, my lords, a stranger had at this time entered the province of Oude, ignorant of what had happened since the death of Sujah Dowlah, that prince who, with a savage heart, had still great lines of character, and who, with all his ferocity in war, had with a cultivating hand preserved to his country the wealth which it derived from benignant skies, and a prolific soil; if observing the wide and general devastation of fields unclothed and brown; of vegetation burnt up and extinguished; of villages depopulated and in ruin; of temples unroofed and perishing; of reservoirs broken down and dry, this stranger would ask, What has thus laid waste this beautiful and opulent land; what monstrous madness has ravaged with widespread war; what desolating foreign foe; what civil discords; what disputed succession; what religious zeal; what fabled monster has stalked abroad and, with malice and mortal enmity to man, withered by the grasp of death

every growth of nature and humanity, all means of delight, and each original, simple principle of bare existence? The answer would have been: Not one of these causes! No wars have ravaged these lands and depopulated these villages! No desolating foreign foe! no domestic broils! no disputed succession! no religious superserviceable zeal! no poisonous monster! no affliction of Providence, which, while it scourges us, cut off the sources of resuscitation!

"No. This damp of death is the mere effusion of British amity! We sink under the pressure of their support! We writhe under their perfidious gripe! They have embraced us with their protecting arms, and lo! these are the fruits of their alliance!"

No clearer case was ever made against a prisoner at the bar, and yet after a seven years' trial before the House of Lords Hastings was acquitted, not because he was guiltless, but because England had acquired territory by his policy.

Lord Macaulay, in describing the crimes perpetrated at that time against a helpless people, gives expression to a truth which has lost none of its force with the lapse of years. He says: "And then was seen what we believe to be the most frightful of all spectacles, the strength of civilization without its mercy. To all other despotism there is a check, imperfect indeed, and liable to gross abuse, but still sufficient to preserve society from the last extreme of misery. A time comes when the evils of submission are obviously greater than those of resistance, when fear itself begets a sort of courage, when a convulsive burst of popular rage and despair warns tyrants not to presume too far on the patience of mankind. But against misgovernment such as then afflicted Bengal, it is impossible to struggle. The superior intelligence and energy of the dominant class made their power irresistible. A war

of Bengalees against Englishmen was like a war of sheep against wolves, of men against demons."

"The strength of civilization without its mercy!"

The American people are capable of governing themselves, but what reason have we to believe that they can wisely administer the affairs of distant races? It is difficult enough to curb corporate power in this country, where the people who suffer have in their own hands the means of redress; how much more difficult it would be to protect the interests of the people where the people who do the governing do not feel the suffering and where the people who do the suffering must rely upon the mercy of alien rulers!

True, Macaulay argues that English morality, tardily but finally, followed English authority into the Orient, but, as a matter of fact, the bleeding of India has continued systematically during the present century. Polite and refined methods have been substituted for the rude and harsh ones formerly employed, and the money received is distributed among a larger number, but the total sum annually drawn from India is greater now than it was when England's foremost orators and statesmen were demanding the impeachment of notorious malefactors.

Sir J. Strachey, an Englishman, in a history recently published, is quoted as saying that "the confiscation of the rights of the ryots (in Bengal) has reached vast proportions." He then shows that through the action of the English government the Zemindars, or middle men, have been able to enormously increase their income at the expense of the tillers of the soil, the increase being from four hundred thousand pounds in the last century to thirteen million pounds at the present time.

On the 28th of December, 1897—only a year ago—

a meeting of the London Indian Society was held at Montague Mansions and strong resolutions adopted. Below will be found an extract from the resolutions:

“That this conference of Indians, resident in the United Kingdom, is of opinion—

“That of all the evils and ‘terrible misery’ that India has been suffering for a century and a half, and of which the latest developments are the most deplorable, famine and plague, arising from ever-increasing poverty, the stupid and suicidal Frontier War and its savagery, of the wholesale destruction of villages, unworthy of any people, but far more so of English civilization; the unwise and suicidal prosecutions for sedition; the absurd and ignorant cry of the disloyalty of the educated Indians, and for the curtailment of the liberty of the Indian press; the despotism—like that of the imprisonment of the Natus, and the general insufficiency and inefficiency of the administration—of all these and many other minor evils the main cause is the unrighteous and un-British system of government which produces an unceasing and ever-increasing bleeding of the country, and which is maintained by a political hypocrisy and continuous subterfuges unworthy of the British honor and name, and entirely in opposition to the wishes of the British people, and utterly in violation of acts and resolutions of Parliament, and of the most solemn and repeated pledges of the British nation and sovereign.

“That unless the present unrighteous and un-British system of government is thoroughly reformed into a righteous and truly British system destruction to India and disaster to the British Empire must be the inevitable result.”

Mr. Naoroji, an Indian residing in England, in supporting the resolution, pointed out the continuous drain of money from India and argued that the people

were compelled "to make brick, not only without straw, but even without clay." He insisted that England's trade with India would be greater if she would allow the people of India a larger participation in the affairs of their own government and protested against the policy of sending Englishmen to India to hold the offices and draw their support from taxes levied upon the inhabitants. He complained that British justice is one thing in England and quite another thing in India, and said: "There (in India) it is only the business of the people to pay taxes and to slave; and the business of the government to spend those taxes to their own benefit. Whenever any question arises between Great Britain and India there is a demoralized mind. The principles of politics, of commerce, of equality which are applied to Great Britain are not applied to India. As if it were not inhabited by human beings!"

Does any one doubt that, if we annex the Philippines and govern them by agents sent from here, questions between them and the people of the United States will be settled by the people of the United States and for the benefit of the people of the United States? If we make subjects of them against their will and for our own benefit are we likely to govern them with any more benevolence?

The resolutions quoted mention efforts for the curtailment of the liberty of the press. Is that not a necessary result of governmental injustice? Are we likely to allow the Filipinos freedom of the press, if we enter upon a system that is indefensible according to our theory of government?

Mr. Hyndman, an English writer, in a pamphlet issued in 1897, calls attention to English indifference to India's wrongs, and, as an illustration of this indifference, cites the fact that during the preceding year the

India budget affecting the welfare of nearly three hundred millions of people was brought before Parliament on the last day of the session when only a few members were present. He asserts that "matters are far worse now than they were in the days of the old East India Company," and that "nothing short of a great famine, a terrible pestilence, or a revolt on a large scale, will induce the mass of Englishmen to devote any attention whatever to the affairs of India."

To show how, in the government of India, the interests of English office-holders outweigh the interests of the natives, I give an extract from the pamphlet already referred to:

"First, under the East India Company, and then, and far more completely, under the direct rule of the Crown of the English people, the natives have been shut out from all the principal positions of trust over five-sixths of Hindostan, and have been prevented from gaining any experience in the higher administration, or in military affairs.

"Wherever it was possible to put in an Englishman to oust a native an Englishman has been put in, and has been paid from four times to twenty times as much for his services as would have sufficed for the salary of an equally capable Hindoo or Mohammedan official. * * * At the present time, out of 39,000 officials who draw a salary of more than 1,000 rupees a year, 28,000 are Englishmen and only 11,000 natives. Moreover, the 11,000 natives receive as salaries only three million pounds a year; the 28,000 Englishmen receive fifteen million pounds a year. Out of the 960 important civil offices which really control the civil administration of India 900 are filled with Englishmen and only sixty with natives. Still worse, if possible, the natives of India have no control whatsoever in any shape or way over their own taxation,

or any voice at all in the expenditure of their own revenues. Their entire government—I speak, of course, of the 250,000,000 under our direct control—is carried on and administered by foreigners, who not only do not settle in the country but who live lives quite remote from those of the people, and return home at about forty-five or fifty years of age with large pensions.

“As I have often said in public, India is, in fact, now governed by successive relays of English carpet-baggers, who have as little sympathy with the natives as they have any real knowledge of their habits and customs.”

The Statesman's Year Book of 1897, published by Macmillan & Co., London, contains some interesting statistics in regard to India.

It seems that there are but two and a quarter millions of Christians in India—less than one per cent—after so many years of English control.

It appears, also, that in 1891 only a little more than three millions out of three hundred millions were under instruction; a little more than twelve millions were not under instruction, but able to read and write, while two hundred and forty-six millions were neither under instruction nor able to read or write. Twenty-five millions appear under the head “not returned.”

The European army in India amounts to seventy-four thousand and the native army to one hundred and forty-five thousand. In the army the European officers number five thousand and the native officers twenty-seven hundred. One-fourth of the national expenditure in India goes to the support of the army. Nearly one-third of India's annual revenue is expended in Great Britain. The salary of the Governor General is 250,000 rupees per annum.

The Year Book above mentioned is also responsible for the statement that the act of 1893, closing the Indian mints to the free coinage of silver, was enacted by the Governor General and Council upon the same day that it was introduced. Mr. Leech, former director of the United States mint, in an article in the Forum, declared that the closing of the mints of India on that occasion was the most momentous event in the monetary history of the present century. It will be remembered that this act was made the excuse for an extra session of our Congress and for the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law.

One can obtain some idea of the evils of irresponsible alien government when he reflects that an English Governor General and an English Council changed the financial system of nearly three hundred millions of people by an act introduced and passed in the course of a single day.

No matter what views one may hold upon the money question, he cannot defend such a system of government without abandoning every principle revered by the founders of the republic. Senator Wolcott, of Colorado, one of the President's commissioners, upon his return from Europe, made a speech in the Senate in which he declared that the last Indian famine was a money famine rather than a food famine. In that speech Mr. Wolcott also asserted that the closing of the India mints reduced, by five hundred millions of dollars, the value of the silver accumulated in the hands of the people. If Mr. Wolcott's statement contains the smallest fraction of truth the injury done by the East India Company during its entire existence was less than the injury done by that one act of the Governor and his Council. If the famine was, in fact, a money famine, created by an act of the Governor and his Council, then indeed is English rule as cruel

and merciless in India to-day as was the rule of the East India Company's agents a century ago.

English rule in India is not bad because it is English, but because no race has yet appeared sufficiently strong in character to resist the temptations which come with irresponsible power.

We may well turn from the contemplation of an imperial policy and its necessary vices to the words of Jefferson in his first inaugural message: "Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question."

WHAT NEXT?

Imperialists seek to create the impression that the ratification of the treaty has terminated the controversy in regard to the future of the Philippines, but there is no ground whatever for such a conclusion. The President has not as yet outlined a policy and Congress has so far failed to make any declaration upon the subject. Several administration senators have expressly denied that ratification commits the United States to the permanent annexation of the Philippine Islands.

The treaty extinguishes Spanish sovereignty, but it does not determine our nation's course in dealing with the Filipinos. In the opinion of many (and I am among the number) the ratification of the treaty, instead of closing the door to independence, really makes easier the establishment of such a government in the Philippine Islands. The matter is now entirely within

the control of Congress, and there is no legal obstacle to prevent the immediate passage of a resolution promising self-government to the Filipinos and pledging the United States to protect their government from outside interference. If we have a right to acquire land we have a right to part with it; if we have a right to secure, by purchase or conquest, a disputed title from Spain, we certainly have a right to give a quit-claim deed to the party in possession.

If the power to part with the islands is admitted, the only question remaining for discussion is whether the United States should permanently hold the Asiatic territory acquired from Spain. For two months the sentiment against imperialism has been constantly growing and there is nothing in the ratification of the treaty to make such a policy more desirable.

Until Dewey's victory no one thought us under obligation to extend our sovereignty over the Filipinos. If subsequent events have imposed such an obligation upon the United States it is worth while to inquire as to its nature and extent. Is it political in its character? Must we make subjects of the Filipinos now because we made allies of them in the war with Spain? France did not recognize any such obligation when she helped us to throw off British supremacy. Are we compelled to civilize the Filipinos by force because we interfered with Spain's efforts to accomplish the same end by the same means? Are we in duty bound to conquer and to govern, when we can find a pretext for doing so, every nation which is weaker than ours or whose civilization is below our standard? Does history justify us in believing that we can improve the condition of the Filipinos and advance them in civilization by governing them without their consent and taxing them without representation? England has tried that plan in India for a hundred and fifty years,

and yet Japan has made more progress in the last thirty years than India has made in the hundred and fifty. And it may be added that the idea of self-government has developed more rapidly among the Japanese during the same period than it has among the people of India.

Government is an evolution and its administration is always susceptible of improvement. The capacity for self-government is developed by responsibility. As exercise strengthens the muscles of the athlete and as education improves the mental faculties of the student, even so participation in government instructs the citizen in the science of government and perfects him in the art of administering it.

We must not expect the Filipinos to establish and maintain as good a government as ours, and it is vain for us to expect that we would maintain there, at long range, as good a government as we have here. The government is, as it were, a composite photograph of the people, a reflection of their average virtue and intelligence.

Some defend annexation upon the ground that the business interests of the islands demand it. The business interests will probably be able to take care of themselves under an independent form of government, unless they are very different from the business interests of the United States. The so-called business men constitute a very small fraction of the total population of the islands, who will say that their pecuniary interests are superior in importance to the right of all the rest of the people to enjoy a government of their own choosing.

Some say that our duty to the foreign residents in the Philippines requires us to annex the islands. If we admit this argument we not only exalt the interests of foreigners above the interests of natives, but place

a higher estimate upon the wishes of foreigners residing in Manila than upon the welfare of our own people.

The fact that the subject of imperialism is being discussed through the newspapers and magazines, as well as in Congress, is evidence that the work of education is still going on. The advocates of a colonial policy must convince the conservative element of the country, by clear and satisfactory proof, they cannot rely upon catch words. The "Who will haul down the flag?" argument has already been discarded, "Destiny" is not as "manifest" as it was a few weeks ago, and the argument of "duty" is being analyzed. The people are face to face with a grave public problem. They have not acted upon it yet, and they will not be frightened away from the calm consideration of it by the repetition of unsupported prophesies. The battle of Manila, which brought loss to us and disaster to the Filipinos, has not rendered "forcible annexation" less repugnant to our nation's "code of morality." If it has any effect at all it ought to emphasize the dangers attendant upon (if I may be permitted to quote from the President again) "criminal aggression." The Filipinos were guilty of inexcusable ignorance if they thought that they could prevent the ratification of the treaty by an attack upon the American lines, but no act of theirs can determine the permanent policy of the United States. Whether imperialism is desirable is too large a question to be settled by a battle. Battles are to be expected under such a policy. England had been the dominant power in India for a century, when the Sepoy mutiny took place, and she rules even now by fear rather than by love.

Force and reason rest upon different foundations and employ different forms of logic. Reason, recognizing that only that is enduring which is just, asks

whether the thing proposed ought to be done; force says, I desire, I can, I will. When the desire proves to be greater than the ability to accomplish, the force argument reads (in the past tense) I desired, I tried, I failed. But even force, if accompanied by intelligence, calculates the cost. No one doubts that the United States army and navy are able to whip into subjection all the Filipinos who are not exterminated in the process, but is it worth the cost?

Militarism is only one item of the cost, but it alone will far outweigh all the advantages which are expected to flow from a colonial policy. John Morley, the English statesman, in a recent speech to his constituents, uttered a warning which may well be considered by our people. He said:

"Imperialism brings with it militarism, and must bring with it militarism. Militarism means a gigantic expenditure, daily growing. It means an increase in government of the power of aristocratic and privileged classes. Militarism means the profusion of the taxpayer's money everywhere except in the taxpayer's own home, and militarism must mean war.

"And you must be much less well read in history than I take the liberals of Scotland to be if you do not know that it is not war, that hateful demon of war, but white-winged peace that has been the nurse and guardian of freedom and justice and well-being over that great army of toilers upon whose labor, upon whose privations, upon whose hardships, after all, the greatness and the strength of empires and of states are founded and are built up."

Militarism is so necessary a companion of imperialism that the President asks for a two hundred per cent increase in the standing army, even before the people at large have passed upon the question of annexation.

Morley says that imperialism gives to the aristoc-

racy and to the privileged classes an increased influence in government; do we need to increase their influence in our government? Surely they are potent enough already.

He calls attention to the fact that the toiler finds his hope in peaceful progress rather than in war's uncertainties. Is it strange that the laboring classes are protesting against both imperialism and militarism? Is it possible that their protest will be in vain?

Imperialism has been described as "The White Man's Burden," but, since it crushes the wealth-producer beneath an increasing weight of taxes, it might with more propriety be called The Poor Man's Load.

If the Peace Commissioners had demanded a harbor and coaling station in the Philippines and had required Spain to surrender the rest of the land to the Filipinos, as she surrendered Cuba to the Cubans, we would not now be considering how to let go of the islands. If the sum of twenty millions had been necessary to secure Spain's release, the payment of the amount by the Filipinos might have been guaranteed by the United States.

But the failure of the Peace Commissioners to secure for the Filipinos the same rights that were obtained for the Cubans, could have been easily remedied by a resolution declaring the nation's purpose to establish a stable and independent government.

It is still possible for the Senate alone, or for the Senate and House together, to adopt such a resolution.

The purpose of annexationists, so far as that purpose can be discovered, is to apply to the government of the Filipinos methods familiar to the people of Europe and Asia, but new in the United States.

This departure from traditions was not authorized by the people; whether it will be ratified by them

remains to be seen. The responsibility rests first upon Congress and afterwards upon that power which makes Congresses.

Whatever may be the wish of individuals or the interests of parties, we may rest assured that the final disposition of the Philippine question will conform to the deliberate judgment of the voters; they constitute the court of last resort; from their decision there is no appeal.


What next? Investigation, discussion, action.

CHAPTER VI.


BRYAN'S MASTERFUL SPEECH.

DELIVERED IN MUSIC HALL, BALTIMORE, JANUARY 20, 1900.

While men may differ as to the extent to which they can help or harm a nation, I believe that at all times the people are able to protect themselves from evil, and that an individual is only important as he can be the means in the hands of the people of protecting their own rights and advancing their own welfare. While to the leader comes the honor, the work is really done by the masses of the people. In politics, as in the army, the generals get the glory and the privates do the work. I feel that I owe it to those who for nearly four years have been bearing the burden in the heat of the day; I owe it to them to say that what I have done is but an atom compared with what they have done. I never lose an opportunity to give credit to that heroic band of Democrats who in 1896 rescued the Democratic party from the domination of plutocracy, and who for three years have stood as a solid wall against those who would lead the Democratic party back to the position it was occupying as a competitor of the Republican party for the favor of the moneyed interests of the United States. In 1896 the voters proved that they could control the policy of the party, and during the last three years they have shown that they can hold what they gained in 1896. In spite of newspapers, in spite of railroads, in spite of banks, and in spite of every influence supposed to be potent, the plain people in the Democratic party



VIEW OF MAIN BODY OF DELEGATES.



NORTHWESTERN DELEGATES LISTENING TO SENATOR TILLMAN'S SPEECH.

have stood, and now stand, for the Chicago platform. When I say that I do not want you to understand that I say it with any feeling of hostility toward those who either stood with the party without accepting all the platform or those who left the party and voted for the Palmer and Buckner ticket, or left the party and voted the Republican ticket; I have never had it in my heart to say one harsh word against the man who, following his conscience and his judgment, either voted with the gold Democrats, or the Republicans; I have admired always—do now and ever shall—the man who makes his vote represent his conscience and his judgment.

I have said that there left us in 1896 two classes of people—those who knew what they were doing, and those who did not know what they were doing. We haven't much hope of getting back those who knew what they were doing—

A Voice—They are all Democrats now.

Mr. Bryan—No; not those who left us, knowing what they were doing; but we have hopes of getting back—and we are now getting back—those who left us without appreciating clearly the magnitude of the struggle in which we were engaged.

There were some who left us, not because they thought themselves out, but because they were attached to great corporate interests that jerked them out of the Democratic party, and those who left because they were more attached to the corporate interests than the principles of Democracy can never get back until that bond of union is severed between them and the corporate interests; and, for my part, I don't want them to come back until they are free.

A Voice—That's the way to talk.

Mr. Bryan—In other words, when a man becomes a Democrat hereafter I want him to be his own master and do his own thinking, and not be compelled to ask anybody what he can think or what he can do.

But really, my friends, the larger part of those who left us in 1896 left us because they were deceived by the leadership of those who knew why they left. Those men had stood high in the politics of the party; they stood high in the business of the community; they stood high in society and in the church, and before the people had a chance to understand the real issues separating the two great forces they were led away by their admiration for and their confidence in those leaders. Those thus led away through ignorance—if I may so express it—are coming back now that they understand that the Chicago platform expresses the aspirations of the plain people for a government such as Jefferson advocated and such as Lincoln defended—a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

In three years our opponents have not been able to take out of that Chicago platform a single plank or line or syllable; and the Democratic party stands to-day for all that it stood for in 1896, and for several new things.

The Republicans were busy enough in 1896, but that was nothing to the industry they will need to manifest this year.

I shall not have time to take up every question and discuss it elaborately, but I am going to discuss several briefly. I see here those whom I imagine to be opponents; those who were not with us in 1896; those who are not with us now, but they show

some liberality of thought when they come to a meeting like this. A person who will put himself under the influences of the sanctuary is not beyond redemption.

If I were talking merely to Democrats, I would not stop to discuss the fundamental principles which underlie all policies, but when you want a man to agree with you you must begin with some proposition that he will accept; and then from that accepted proposition you must reason with him until he agrees with your conclusions.

Now I want to begin with an accepted proposition—that proposition which I consider most fundamental in government.

I find it in the Declaration of Independence—if you will pardon me for quoting anything from that old and outworn document, as our Republican friends seem to think it. The Declaration of Independence was once a highly-respected document; it is under a cloud just now, but I have confidence that in a few months the clouds will roll by and that old document will shine with all its former brightness. That fundamental principle is that all men are created equal. Is this right? Is it true or is it false?

I do not mean to say that all men are created equal in physical strength; I do not mean to say that all men are created equal in mental ability, or in moral worth, or that under any just form of government, all men will be equal in capacity for enjoyment, or in worldly goods. What I mean to say is this: that whenever government comes into contact with the citizen, whenever the citizen touches the government, then all must stand equal before the law, and there must be no high, no low, no rich,

no poor. That government must be administered according to the maxim of Jefferson: "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

Now, if that doctrine is false, then my philosophy is vain, and I cannot hope to reach a correct conclusion on any subject. If that doctrine is true, as I believe it is, then that doctrine should be applied to every question before the people now, or which shall hereafter arise. I am willing to drop every policy that I have ever defended if convinced that that policy violates the doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. If there are Republicans here will they agree to drop every policy that violates that doctrine if convinced of its violation? If not, then they are not true to this fundamental principle of government. I am going to assume that they will drop every policy when convinced that it violates—the doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none—and assuming that they will consent to accept our views when convinced that our views are right, I am going to ask the Republicans here to think for a little while when they go home of the income tax, and to see if it is not in line with that doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. How do we collect our federal taxes to-day? Well, before the Spanish war broke out we collected almost the entire tax from two sources, from internal revenue duties on liquor and tobacco and from import duties on what we eat and wear and use. In what proportion do the people pay these taxes? In proportion to benefits received from government? Not at all. In proportion to property? Not at all. In proportion to income? Not at all. In what proportion do people pay internal revenue taxes? Why, largely

in proportion to the liquor and tobacco they use. They do not use those things in proportion to their income, and so far as you collect taxes from liquor and tobacco, you make the poor man pay on an average a larger percentage of his income to support the government, and the rich man a smaller percentage on his income.

Don't understand me to object to an internal revenue tax on liquor and tobacco; but understand me to say that if all of your taxes are collected that way, or a large part of your taxes are collected that way, then, just to the extent you collect from that source the man with a small income pays more than his share, and the man with a large income less than his share; and unless you equalize these things you unequally distribute the burdens of government.

Do people pay import duties in proportion to incomes? Do men eat taxed goods in proportion to income? If there is any difference, the poor man will pay more than the rich man. Some one has said the poor man is looking for food for his stomach, while the rich man goes from one watering place to another, looking for a stomach for his food.

Men don't wear clothing in proportion to income. A man with an income of \$100,000 does not, on an average, spend one hundred times as much for clothing as a man with an income of \$1,000; so that when you collect your taxes largely from import duties you make the poor man pay more than his share and the rich man pay less. And if you collect all your taxes from these two sources you overburden the poor man and underburden the rich man.

When the Spanish war broke out we had to have more taxes, and the Republican party looked around for any old thing to put a stamp on. Every

time I send a telegram I have to pay the regular rate, and in addition thereto one cent is added for the benevolent assimilation of the Filipino.

Why is it that the man who sends the telegram has to pay the tax? Because the telegraph company says so, and why was the law so made that the telegraph company could shift the burden on to the man who sends the telegram? Because the telegraph companies have more influence with the Republican party than all the poor Republicans who send telegrams.

In 1859 Lincoln wrote a letter in which he said that the Republican party believed in the man and the dollar, but that in case of conflict it believed in the man before the dollar; and during the early years of his administration he sent a message to Congress, and in that message he said that he felt it to be his duty to warn his countrymen against the approach of monarchy. What scared him? He said it was the attempt to put capital upon an equal footing, if not above labor in the structure of government. It frightened Lincoln. What would he think to-day if he were here and saw capital placed above labor by those who have been making the laws of the United States? I want to assert that to-day the Republican party, instead of putting the man first and the dollar afterward, puts the dollar first and the man afterward, if at all.

In the subject of taxation you can see the extent to which this vicious doctrine has been applied. Why, in the dissenting opinion of Justice Brown, of the Supreme Court, speaking of the income tax decision, he said: "I fear that in some hour of national peril this decision will rise up to paralyze the arm of the government." I wondered why people

didn't see it. But the hour of peril came, and when the government needed more revenue it couldn't collect its tax upon incomes, because this decision did rise up to paralyze the arm of government, and then people saw what many did not see before, that this nation is unlimited when it deals with the citizen, but limited when it deals with property.

In an hour of peril this government can take the son from his mother, the husband from his wife, the father from his child, and stand them up in front of the enemy's guns, but in an hour of danger this government cannot lay its hands upon accumulated wealth and make that wealth bear its share of the expenses of the government that protects it.

Why is it? It is because the Republican party has made money more precious than blood. My friends, you heard men denounce our income tax in 1896. I want to say that it is stronger to-day than it was then. And if those who have been shirking their taxes think that they have settled this question forever, I want to tell them that the income tax will be in the next campaign, and that the fight will continue until the Constitution of the United States is so amended as to specifically authorize an income tax, so that neither one judge nor nine judges can build a legal bulwark around the fortunes of the great and throw the burdens of government upon the backs of the struggling poor.

But this is only one question. I am going to speak of another question which shows how the Republican party is looking after the interests of wealth and neglecting the welfare of the people. I am going to say a word on the money question. I know they say that the money question is a dead issue. But, my friends, silver has been buried so

often that a little thing like a funeral doesn't bother us like it used to. In 1892 my opponent for Congress said we would never hear of the money question after that election, but it was up again in 1893; and the President called Congress together to repeal the Sherman law and bury it again; and when the Sherman law was buried they said that that settled it; but it was up again in 1894, and had to be buried again; was up again in 1895, and had to be buried again; and even the Republicans remember it was up in 1896.

But they said they buried it then for good. I know they did, because that campaign is so recent that even a young man like myself can remember it distinctly. And I remember that the next day after the election the Republican papers said that question was settled forever. But it was up in 1897, and had to be buried again; and then it was up in 1898, and had to be buried again; and it was up last fall, and they went through with the usual obsequies. But I have examined the so-called corpse, and it is my candid opinion that it has life enough left to last another year. Why is it they have to bury it so often? Because they never bury it well. Why don't they bury it once well and be done with it? Because no tomb was ever made so strong that it could imprison a righteous cause. And I have my suspicions that, sad as the funeral is, the gold bugs would rather go to a funeral than to a debating society, they would rather bury the silver question than discuss it.

My friends, you hear people say that you ought not to resurrect this question. I want to tell you that the American people never adopted the gold standard. I hear people talk about a wonderful

victory for the gold standard in 1896. Why, have you read the history of that campaign? Six million five hundred thousand voters voted for independent bimetalism at the rate of 16 to 1, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation, and seven millions voted for a ticket pledged to international bimetalism; thirteen and a half millions voted for the double standard as against the gold standard, and only one hundred and thirty-two thousand supported the only ticket that ever stood for a gold standard in the United States. I want you to know that the only party that ever went before this nation with a gold standard platform sprang into existence just before the election and sprang out of existence immediately afterward.

Mr. McKinley sent a commission all the way to Europe to ask the nations of Europe to help us to restore bimetalism. If we adopted the gold standard in 1896 why did the Republican President send all the way to Europe to get rid of the thing we had adopted? Why did his Government go to France and ask France to help, and why did France join in the effort to get rid of the gold standard? Why did the laboring men of England send the petition to the English government asking that government to join in the restoration of bimetalism? Why did the farmers of England want bimetalism if the gold standard was good? There was an English commission appointed to inquire and report on the condition of English agriculture, and they reported by a vote of ten to four that the gold standard was the chief cause of agricultural depression in England and pointed to bimetalism as the only hope of English farmers. But you tell me England did not help us. But why? On the 27th day

of September, 1897, the bankers of London met in the Clearing House—few enough of them to meet in a clearing house—they closed the door, and, pledged themselves to secrecy, they said the gold standard was all right; and those bankers, meeting secretly, controlled the action of the English government, and through the action of the English government controlled the action of Europe, and through Europe and the Republican party they are controlling the action of the American people.

People ask me why I don't drop the money question, as though if I were to drop it, it might break. It would have no effect on the money question if I did drop it; it is in the keeping of no man, and it would not make any difference whether I adhere to it or disregard it. But if you ask why I do not drop it, I will tell you that I am not willing that a handful of English bankers shall control seventy millions of American people. But you will hear people say that new conditions have arisen that now make the gold standard palatable. Isn't it strange that men who have labored to fasten the gold standard on this country for thirty years should now be defending their position by arguments that have arisen since the election? You don't hear the argument you heard in 1896. They said then that we had gold enough, that we didn't need any more; and now every Republican who makes a speech in favor of the gold standard tells of the wonderful increase in the discovery of gold since 1896, and says that we now have enough money. And yet, my friends, with all this newly discovered evidence, with all of this output from the mines, unpromised and unexpected in 1896, the Secretary of the Treasury tells

you he has to give money to favorite banks, in order to keep enough money in circulation.

Statistics, they will tell you, show we have \$200,000,000 more gold in this country now than in 1896, and that for that reason we don't need bimetallism any more; and yet with that increase of \$200,000,000 in gold supply of this nation there was a panic in Wall Street the other day because there was a panic in London. Because of some reverses in South Africa the markets of London were disturbed, and because the markets over there were shaky they were shaky here, and the financiers had to rush in with money to lend to bring the rate down from 186 per cent., and the treasury had to go in to help them out.

Ah, my friends, if a few reverses in a war with a handful of Boers will shake our financial system, where will the gold standard be if England ever attacks a nation of her size and gets into a real war.

When we join ourselves to the gold standard; when we make gold alone the legal tender for the payment of debts, we connect ourselves with every disturbance in Europe, and make ourselves dependent upon their conditions for our prosperity.

You tell me it is a sound system! It is false; that system is not sound. Tell me it is an American system? It is a lie; there is no such American system; there is no American system that makes us tremble every time there is trouble among the gold standard countries of the Old World. What do you find now? Why, you find among the financiers the fear that there will be a panic if the Boers continue to fight successfully for their homes. The financiers are afraid that if England does not win soon there will be trouble, and because these financiers fear

the effect of the success of the Boers, men who in their hearts love liberty are afraid to say a word in defense of the Boers, and have a financial interest in praying that the dominion of the Queen may be extended while a republic falls.

That is what it means to lose your independence. The influence that controls our financial policy can control our policy on every question, and I for one shall continue to fight until this nation asserts and secures the right to attend to its own business on every question without asking the aid or consent of any nation on earth.

But, my friends, have you considered the circumstances under which this new policy is to be forced upon the American people, I will remind you again that in 1896 both the great parties—aye, four great parties advocated the double standard—differing only as to the means of getting it; and now the Republican party would make the gold standard permanent. The Republican party could not secure that bill making the gold standard permanent from the Congress elected in 1896. The Republicans told you what a great victory they won then; but it was not a victory great enough to enable them to make the gold standard permanent. They had to wait until 1898, and in 1898, when the people were engaged in a war, and when the Republican leaders with perspiring patriotism were appealing to the people to hold up the hands of the President, the financiers were planning to hold up the people. Yes, when the American people were being appealed to not to discredit the administration while it was making a treaty with a foreign nation, the financiers were secretly planning to capture Congress in order that it might do what the Ameri-

can people had never commissioned any party to do. And, now, they want to force that bill through under whip and spur for fear if they do not get it through this time they will never have a chance to get it through again.

But the gold standard part is only one part. That bill not only provides for the gold standard, not only provides that we shall be chained to the financial system of the old world, but it provides that we shall revive the greenbacks and turn over our paper money to the national banks. I challenge you to find a word in your platform of 1896 that promised to retire the greenbacks and substitute bank notes. I challenge you to find in the letter of acceptance of your President a single word that indicated that he would try to retire the greenbacks and form a paper money trust for the benefit of the national banks of the United States.

If the Republican party had placed in its platform an outline of the bill now before Congress, or the President had placed that outline in his letter of acceptance, he could not have been President of the United States; and yet to-day the Republican party is seeking to change the entire financial policy of this nation, to drive the government out of the business of issuing money in order to turn that business over to the national banks of the United States.

Have you considered the plan; do you realize the favoritism that you bestow upon national banks? Let me state the proposition in its most favorable terms; They say "Let us authorize the President to issue bonds, to buy gold, and redeem every greenback presented for redemption, and when redeemed the greenback is not to be issued again, except as a gold certificate," and there is no difference between

retiring the greenback entirely and issuing gold certificates when the gold is deposited and putting the greenback in the treasury, and issuing it as a certificate for gold. It is merely a dishonest way of doing what might honestly be done by the retirement of the greenbacks.

Then they will have all of the bonds funded with two per cent. bonds, and then the banks may issue money up to the par value of the bonds, and the tax is reduced from one per cent. to one-half of one per cent.

When the bill becomes a law, then, if an ordinary Republican wants to buy a government bond at 2 per cent. he will rake together the money to pay for the bond and will put it away in a place for safe keeping. He will be out the use of the money, and he will get 2 per cent. on the bond.

But if a national bank, with a capital of \$100,000, wants to invest in the same bond, the bank can buy the bonds for \$100,000, deposit them with the treasury, get back \$100,000 in currency, which will take the place of the money spent for the bonds. And then the bank will get 2 per cent. on the \$100,000 and pay one-half per cent. back, and thus it draws $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the \$100,000 with actually nothing invested at all.

That is a simple analysis of the matter. The ordinary man, when he buys a bond, is out the use of his money, and has to be satisfied with the interest on the bond, but the bank gets the money back and gets the interest on the bond, too.

My mother used to tell me when I was a boy that I could either eat my cake or keep it, but the national bank can both eat its cake and keep it. Why? Because the national banks have more influ-

ence with the Republican party than all of the people who pay the taxes.

But there is another feature of it. This is to be a permanent policy. The government is to go out of the business of issuing money and the national banks are to supply whatever paper money the people need. The bank is to have the right to expand the currency. We are to have an elastic currency. An elastic currency, with the banks holding both ends of the elastic.

Yes, they can expand the currency and contract it, but they cannot expand it beyond the amount of the bonds. Therefore, if the money must increase with population and business, then the bonded debt of this nation must not only be permanent, but must be an increasing debt. The Republican party seeks to fasten upon this country a perpetual and ever increasing debt, in order that the banks may control the volume of the people's money.

And this measure is to be forced through Congress with all the power of an administration when the American people have never had a chance to sit in judgment upon the proposition.

That, my friends, is a simple statement of what you can expect under the best conditions of this bill. But do you think it safe to let the banks control the volume of your money? I cannot understand how any one who knows human nature, or who has read history, can be willing to give this great power into the hands of private corporations and bankers. Let me warn you, that when you join with other bankers in an effort to give the banks advantages over all the rest of the people, when you once establish the doctrine that favoritism is good, you will find that you cannot stop that principle with the bankers;

but they will begin to apply it then as between bankers, and after the banks swallow up all the rest of the people, then the big banks will swallow up the little banks.

And it has been proposed recently that we have branch banks, a great central bank, with branches throughout the country. What does it mean? It means that when there is once established that system, that this branch bank with the power of the central bank behind it, can drive out of business every other bank in the community, and then the people will be at the mercy of that one institution. It means that the big banks will absorb the little ones, and then finally all the banks will be in the hands of a few men, and all the business will be controlled by a few men, and then if any one has any stock that the managers of the bank want, all the bankers have to do is to refuse to consider that collateral, drive down its value, bankrupt the holder, and buy the thing in at their own price.

Is it not strange; that any one, not a national banker, can look without alarm upon this proposed currency bill.

But when, my friends, we say anything on the money question, we are told that there is great prosperity now, and that you must not discuss the money question for fear you will injure the present conditions. I want to tell you that there can be no prosperity in this country that does not start with the producers of wealth. Out in my State, in 1897, wheat went up to \$1 a bushel, and all the Goldbugs talked about wheat rising in price, and appealed to the people to vote the Republican ticket because wheat had gone up under a Republican administration. But this year, wheat was down and cattle



THE HEADS OF THE NEW YORK DELEGATION.



IN THE REPORTERS' CORNER.

were up, and the people were appealed to to vote the Republican ticket because cattle went up; but potatoes were down; next year, if potatoes are up and cattle down, every Republican speaker will have his pocket full of potatoes, and will be urging the rise in potatoes as the reason why the people should vote the Republican ticket and not disturb the existing conditions.

Why, my friends, the Republican party has no plan that is intended to bring good to the great masses of the people. The farmers' prosperity is fundamental, and I ask you what plan the Republicans have to bring prosperity to the farmer? The farmers' prosperity comes from two sources—an increased crop and a rise in price. Can the Republican administration or any Republican policies bring an increased crop? You would imagine, to hear Republicans talk, that the Republicans controlled the rain supply and gave bounteous showers when the people were good and voted the Republican ticket, and sent hot winds, if they repudiated the Republican party; but any man who will stop to think for a moment will understand that the Republicans do not control the rain supply, because if they did they would have a monopoly on water, and you would have to buy every shower at a high price.

Now, my friends, if the Republican party does not bring a bounteous harvest, does it promise to bring increased prices? Why, no. In 1896 the Republicans circulated a pamphlet among the railroad men and the wage-earners, telling them that the beauty of the gold standard was that under it a dollar would buy more of the farmer's product. This is the argument they made to the men who were living on

wages, that what they wanted was a rising dollar, a dollar that would buy more of what the farmer had to sell, which meant falling prices. But now every time anything goes up the Republicans claim credit for it; that is, if it is the act of God; and if it is the act of a trust they don't say anything about it.

Now, you people may think that you can have a financial system that will confine the world to gold for standard money, and thus increase the strain upon that metal, and by so doing increase the purchasing power of a dollar. You may think you can do it, and can drive down the value of the products of labor without doing detriment to society; but I want to tell you that the same party that is driving down the prices of what the farmer sells is permitting the organization of the trusts to raise the price on what the farmer has to buy. How long can he stand it? I want to warn you that in a test of endurance he can stand it longer than you people in the city. The farmer was the first man on the scene when civilization began. He will be the last to disappear when civilization disappears. The farmer is the most independent man in the world. He can live off his farm, and if it is necessary the farmer can go back to the old times when his wife made the clothing of the family. The farmer can live, but, my friends, if you take away the power of the farmer to purchase the products of your factories, it will take the accumulated wealth of your cities to feed your starving men.

The Republican party has no plan that commences at the bottom and builds up a prosperity for the American people, and yet every time anything comes that is good the Republican party claims credit for it.

But, my friends, pardon me for dwelling so long on this question. Let me pass from it with this remark: When a man tells you that the increased production of gold has been good, ask him why, and if he says because it has given us more money, ask him what has become of the theory of 1896, that it does not make any difference whether you have much money or little, just so it is all good?

When a man tells you now that more gold means more money, and that more money means better times, you tell him that he has admitted the quantitative theory of money, and that is what we contended for in 1896. We wanted more gold, and we wanted silver, too; and if we had had bimetallism, we would have had all the advantage that has come from an increased production of gold, and, in addition thereto, we would have had the advantage of silver being coined into standard money along with gold. ✓

If a man tells you that we cannot maintain the parity between gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, you remind him that for twenty years the goldbug said we could not maintain the parity because silver was being produced more rapidly than gold, and remind him that if the overproduction of silver made it difficult to maintain the parity the overproduction of gold will now make it easy to maintain the parity.

But I must pass to the trust question.

If there is one here who is opposed to an industrial trust, and does not understand that the principle underlying the industrial trust is exactly the same as the principle underlying the money trust, I ask him to study the question. When a man asks me to get down on his little platform, opposing merely

the industrial trust, I tell him to get up on our broad platform that opposes all trusts—the money trusts, the industrial trust and the international land-grabbing trust.

I want to suggest to the Republicans here that until three years ago they never heard a Republican advocate a trust; but now they can hardly hear a Republican denounce a trust. What has made the change? Republicans, can you guess? Let me suggest the reason for it: For the last three years the Republican party has been in power, and while in power these great monopolies have grown with more rapidity than ever before. If a Republican denounces a trust now somebody asks him, well, why don't the Republicans put them down? And therefore the Republican has to be a little careful about denouncing the trust. And when you hear the Republican speak now he generally tells you that there are good trusts and bad trusts, and then he spends one word denouncing the bad trust and sixteen words warning you not to hurt the good one. That is what you find to-day. I am reminded of a picture that a mother once showed to her boy to impress upon his youthful mind the sufferings of the Christian martyrs. The picture showed the lions tearing Christians to pieces in the arena. The child looked at the picture for a moment, and, then, as he thought he had caught the idea his face brightened up, and pointing down into one corner of the picture, he said; "Why, mamma, there is one poor little lion that is not getting a bit." You tell Republicans that the people are suffering from the trust, and they look at the picture, and then they see one trust that they think is not getting its share, and then all their sympathy goes out to that poor

little trust. Ask a Republican why his party does not pass a law against trusts, and he will tell you that there is a law now on the statute books. Well, then you point out a trust and ask why that trust is not destroyed, and he will tell you that the law does not quite reach that case. It reminds me of a little boy at the table watching his father help the plates. As his father helped one plate the boy asked: "What, all that for grandma?" And the father said: "No, my son, this plate is for you." The boy rejoined, "Oh, what a little bit."

My friends, if any Republican here believes that the Republican party is going to destroy the trusts, I want to remind him of something I read over in Ohio. Now, if you want to find out what the Republican party is going to do, don't ask a little Republican, ask that big Republican up to whom all little Republicans look every morning and say, "Give us this day our daily opinion." I was over in Ohio and I ran across some speeches made by Mr. Hanna. Gentlemen, don't do that way; Mr. Hanna has himself complained that his Senatorial dignity is not properly respected. In one speech Mr. Hanna said that we really don't have any trusts, and then in another speech he said that the trust is a natural evolution of business, necessary for the manufacturing interests of the United States, and then, as if he thought possibly he hadn't covered the entire ground, he added, "but don't be afraid of the so-called trusts, if they are injurious we will take care of them."

Think of it! "Don't be afraid of the so-called trusts; if they are injurious we will take care of them." I don't like to bring an accusation against a great man, but, my friends, I feel it my duty to

tell you that the sentiment contained in that assurance was borrowed from one of Æsop's Fables. A farmer was building a hen house for the protection of his chickens, and a fox came along and said "Don't waste your time on hen houses, go on with your plowing and we will take care of your chickens; we understand the chicken business;" don't be afraid of foxes, we will take care of the chicken business.

There are three defenses: there are no trusts; trusts are good; don't be afraid of so-called trusts; but if they are bad we will take care of them. It reminds me of a man who was sued for returning a kettle cracked and he put up three defenses: he said he never borrowed the kettle, in the second place, it was cracked when he got it, and third, it was good when he took it home.

Is it possible that the people can be deceived by this jugglery? And yet there are men to-day in the Republican party who oppose the trusts and are confidently waiting for the Republican party to destroy them. Why, if the Republican party destroyed the trust it would destroy the hen that lays the golden egg in campaign days; and the Republican party would not kill a hen that laid a *silver* egg if it could get the egg.

Now the question we have to decide is whether a monopoly in private hands is good or bad. If it is good then we ought not to try to destroy the trusts. But, my friends, I do not believe that any candid man, studying this question, will come to the conclusion that a monopoly in private hands is good. Not until God sends us angels to take charge of the monopolies will we dare to trust monopoly in private hands, and from our experience with those

who have taken charge I believe that they come, not from above, but from below. If they are bad are you going to say you can't help yourselves, that you must submit to the trust or to the monopoly? No, my friends, the American people don't have to submit to anything that is detrimental to their welfare. In a Government like ours if things are bad it is because the people permit them to be so, and you can destroy the monopoly when you want to. The trouble is that the monopoly never makes an open warfare in its defense but secretly controls the instrumentalities of government and thus protects itself from prosecution.

I want to remind you that there is a difference between the being made by the Almighty and the corporation created by man. Every monopoly rests upon a corporation, and corporations are creatures of law. They have no rights except those rights granted by the people, and the people who create the corporations have the right to place upon them such limitations as may be necessary for the protection of the public welfare. Let me show you the difference between the natural man of flesh and blood created by the Almighty and the fictitious person called the corporation created by man. When God created man he did not make the tallest man much taller than the shortest; he did not make the strongest man much stronger than the weakest; but when man created the corporate man he made that corporate man a hundred, a thousand, aye, sometimes a million times greater than the natural man. When God made man he placed a limit to his existence, so that if he was a bad man he could not be bad long; but when man created the corporate man he raised the limit on age, and sometimes the cor-

poration has been made perpetual. When God made man he breathed into him a soul and warned him that in the next world he would be held accountable for deeds done in the flesh; but when man made the corporate man he was careful not to give him a soul, so that if he can escape punishment here he need not worry about the hereafter.

And then this man-made giant was sent out to compete with the God-made man. The Republican party has taken the side of the man-made giant, and, because it will contribute liberally in the campaign, the Republican party protects it from prosecution after the campaign is over. If these great aggregations of wealth take the side of the Republican party, then it seems to me that the God-made men had better look out for themselves.

You ask me what you can do. I do not mean to say that there is but one remedy, nor do I mean to say that there is no better remedy than the one I suggest; but I believe there is an easy remedy that will make monopoly impossible. The Constitution has given to Congress control over interstate commerce. There are certain things which the state can do—and I would not take from the state a single power that it now has—to destroy the trusts. Place upon the corporation from the outside doing business in the state such limitations as the people of the state may think necessary for their protection. I will go further than that. I believe the state should be permitted, if it pleases, to exclude any outside corporation from doing business in the state; for while the natural man in different states may compete with one another, I do not believe that an individual in one state must suffer competition with a fictitious person created in another state, and

regulated by laws beyond the reach of people living outside of that state. But after the state has done all it can, I believe the power will not be complete over monopoly, for the state can only stop the monopoly at the state line, and if a monopoly has forty-four states in which to work, it may be able to get along without the forty-fifth; but if you will stop the corporation when it attempts to go out of its own state there can not be any monopoly because it is shut out of the other forty-four. And I believe that Congress has the power, and ought to exercise it, to say that no corporation organized in any state shall do business outside of that state until it secures permission from Congress or some body created by it, and that permission can be granted only when the corporation shows that there is no water in its stock, and that it is not attempting to monopolize any branch of business or the production of any article of merchandise. Then make all the transactions of the corporation public by regular reports. I believe you can thus prevent the organization of a private monopoly. But if these conditions are not sufficient, you can add conditions that are sufficient, because I believe that monopoly in private hands is bad; and that being so it can not be tolerated, and that, therefore, you must devise and enforce such remedies as will be sufficient for the protection of the people.

But, my friends, there is still a newer question than the trust question. We had the trust question in 1896. The principle was the same then as now; but we have more trusts now, therefore the question is more important. The flea question is just the same in principle, whether there is one flea or whether there are a million; but the flea question

becomes more important as the number of fleas increases. And so the question was the same in 1896 as it is now, but as there are more trusts to-day the question has become of more importance to the people; and men who couldn't see what was going on in 1896 are able to see now; those who didn't feel what was going on in 1896, feel what is going on now. In the earlier campaigns in Nebraska I had the aid of the traveling men; I appreciated their support. I tell you, my friends, you can't find a body of men of higher intelligence than the traveling men; and I don't know of any persons who talk as much and as well for the money they receive for it as the traveling men. I was glad to have them with me in the earlier campaigns, I was sorry they were not with me in 1896. I remember that in this hall there were gathered many traveling men who were on our side—men who understood what the money trust meant to the farmer and, by protecting the farmer from a money trust were protecting themselves also from the same principle applied to the other industries of the nation. But most of the traveling men were against us in 1896 and they were preaching that all we needed was Republican success, that we would then have prosperity and all men, including traveling men, would be happy. There are many traveling men who, in 1900 will not travel over as much ground as they did in 1896, but they will speak with more earnestness. For they have seen what monopoly means, and many of them have more time to study and discuss public questions now than they have had for many years. .

. But there are questions which are entirely new. We have had two questions forced into the arena of politics since the war. They are new questions,

questions which the American people have not had a chance to consider, and I want to dwell on them for a little while to-night. The first is the size of our standing army. How many soldiers did we have in the regular army in 1896? Twenty-five thousand. Twenty-five thousand soldiers were enough for a republic of seventy millions of people, and yet in December, 1898, the President asked Congress to authorize the raising of a standing army of 100,000, an army four times as great. What does it mean? It means a gigantic step toward militarism in the United States. Is it possible that the people can see this step taken without alarm? Heretofore we have depended upon the citizen soldier; he has been our anchor; we have said we would do what was right and then, if we had trouble, we could call upon our citizens to defend the nation. But now we are to have a hired soldiery like the nations of Europe, an army four times as great as the army that we had when the Republican party came into power, and this, of course, was to be made without consulting the people, because, if you look at the platform of the Republican party in 1896 you will find that there was no plank in there asking for an army of one hundred thousand, or for any increase in the standing army. Why do we need a large army now? Why? They say that it is because of the new policy upon which the nation has entered. But have the people decided to enter upon a new policy? There has been no vote by the people since the President's policy has been declared. This message asking for one hundred thousand soldiers for the regular army was sent to Congress a month after the election at which the present Congress was elected, and the people have

never decided upon the foreign policy that is relied upon to justify an army of one hundred thousand. But, my friends, if we have imperialism, we shall have militarism; if we have a policy that reaches out by force and drags under the flag unwilling subjects, it will be necessary to have a large army to keep those peoples from making faces as they swallow benevolent assimilation.

And, therefore these questions can be treated together; if we don't have imperialism, they can't justify a large army; if we do have imperialism, you will never see the day when we have a smaller army than we have now. There are some who think that we have no right to discuss the Philippine question while the war lasts. I want to read you something on this subject.

And before reading this to you I want to remind you that the Republican party is trying to adopt the policy of imperialism without first asking the opinion of the American people upon the subject. This Congress was elected in 1898, and when this Congress was elected the treaty of peace had not been signed. The treaty of peace between this country and Spain was signed on the 10th day of December, a month after the election of the present Congress; and the question of imperialism has never been submitted to the American people. Yet Republicans tell you you dare not say a word in condemnation of the policy of the administration; that you shall have this policy fastened upon you and that everybody who likes it shall be allowed to say amen, but that those who do not like it must keep still. It is a new doctrine in the United States, it is a new doctrine that you can not criticise a public servant or a party in power. And for the benefit of

those Republicans who have been making abusive remarks about men who protest against imperialism, I want to read an extract from a speech made by Abraham Lincoln when he was in the Congress of the United States during the war with Mexico. The war had been in progress for twenty months, and yet Abraham Lincoln made a speech against the policy of the President. When I read what Lincoln said I feel that I have not lived up to my opportunities in the way of criticism. He says: "The President feels the blood of this war like the blood of Baal is crying to Heaven against him." That is pretty severe. And in another place, speaking of the President, he says: "And this shows that the President is in nowise satisfied with his own position. First he takes up one, and in trying to argue us into it he argues himself out of it." That is pretty harsh it seems to me, to say against the President. But then he added, "He knows not where he is; he is a bewildered, confounded and miserably perplexed man; God grant that he may be able to show that there is not something about his conscience more painful than all is mental perplexity."

Now that is what Lincoln said against the President; and yet you know the people elected that same Lincoln President twelve years afterward. And there are Republicans now who think that he was a great man, only that he didn't have the benefit of these modern conditions.

Ah, my friends, it will be a sad day when the people of this nation are not able to criticise their public servants. It will be a sad day when every act of every public servant can not be brought before the bar of public opinion. I read a speech the other

day in which a man said we must not criticise the President here because the Filipinos don't understand free speech, that when they read anything said in this country against the President, they suppose that the President must be in a minority, or else he wouldn't permit that thing to be said. Do you see the philosophy of it? When this race comes into contact with an inferior race that does not understand free speech, then, instead of lifting them up and making them to understand free speech, we are to be denied free speech because they can't understand it.

I want to distinguish between expansion and imperialism. Republicans try to hide behind the word expansion. They say, we have expanded in the past. Yes, my friends, this government has expanded. This nation has secured contiguous territory, territory suitable for settlement by American people, and that new territory has been settled and built up into states; but when we have expanded heretofore we have extended the limits of a republic. Now we are asked, not to expand the limits of a republic, but to aspire to an imperial destiny and convert a republic into an empire.

Be not deceived. There is nothing in the past like that which we now are asked to embark upon. Heretofore we have had no expansion that separated citizens into two classes. Heretofore when people have come in they have come in to share in the destiny of this nation. This is the first time that we have been told that we must cross an ocean, conquer a people, drag them under our flag and then tell them they are never to be citizens, but are to be subjects, and to be treated with kindness by our people. It is the first time it has ever been pro-

posed. And what defenses do you hear made of it? Well, I have heard three defenses; first, there is the financial argument, that there is money in it; then there is the religious argument, that God is in it, and then there is the political argument, that we are in it and can't get out. I have never heard any other argument, and I will venture the assertion that if you will take the speech of an imperialist and analyze it you will find that all his argument will come under one of these three heads, that there is money in it, that God is in it, or that we are in it and can't get out.


Take the money argument, that there is money in it. It is the lowest argument ever made in defense of a public policy. The argument of dollars and cents, the argument that is blind to ethics and only looks for money. Republicans, has your party fallen to so low a state that it will attempt to settle a question of so great moment by the measure of dollars and cents? And yet the man who attempts to settle this question in that way, and who says that it will pay, has upon him the burden of proof, to show first how much we will spend, and secondly how much we will get. He must show that we will get more than we will spend or it won't pay; and then he must show that the men who spend the money we spend will get the money we make. He can't show either. He can't show we will get back more than we spend; and if he could show that, he can't show that the men who spend the money we spend will get back the money that comes from an imperial policy. The expense will come from all the people—the income will come to the syndicates that are organized to develop the Philippine Islands.

But, my friends, how is he going to show what it


will cost us? Who can tell the cost of a war of conquest? Who can tell how much it will cost to conquer and hold in subjection eight millions of Malays, seven thousand miles away from our shores, scattered over twelve hundred islands, living under a tropical sun and fighting from the protection of the jungle, and who can tell how often we will have to repeat the chastisement? Who can tell how long it will be before they will fall in love with our idea of a military government? Ah, my friends, the man who says it will pay must show first how much money we will spend, and then he must show you how many lives it will cost, and then he must tell you how much a life is worth. When he tells you it will pay, he must put a money value upon each American life. Republicans, I dare you to put a money value upon an American life! When a boy dies for liberty, his mother thanks God that she has borne a son for so noble a sacrifice, but where is a mother who will rear sons to exchange for oriental trade at so much a head?

I want trade. I want to expand our trade by peaceful means, but I would not put one American boy on the auction block and sell him for all the trade of the world. And yet the man who says it will pay must be prepared to figure with pencil how much the boy is worth.

They say that these islands will furnish homes for our surplus population. Think of it; sixty people to the square mile over there now and twenty people to the square mile here. Furnish homes for our surplus population? Why, my friends, when it is possible for people to pass freely from the Philippine Islands to the United States, and from the United States to the Philippine Islands, there will



A E Stevenson



John Brown

be more Malays coming to this country to bring their oriental habits and compete with American labor than there will be Americans going over there to live in the tropics. Other nations have tried it. England has the island of Jamaica southeast of here. There are 600,000 black people alone there, and less than 14,000 whites. The Netherlands have controlled Java for three hundred years, and there are 25,000,000 of brown people and less than 60,000 of European blood. Spain has controlled the Philippines for three hundred years, and yet there are less than 10,000 Spanish residents out of 10,000,000 of people. England has dominated India for a century and a half, and there are only 100,000 people of British birth out of 300,000,000 there, and it takes a British army of 70,000 to take care of that 100,000, and it takes a native army of 140,000 to help the British army of 70,000 to take care of 100,000 of European birth, who ride the 300,000,000 people there; and if you think that the people of India love the English government, just remember that when the war broke out in South Africa England had to call for volunteers at home, because she dared not take the soldiers out of India.

A man named Morrison has recently written a book in defense of the English government of India. He had been over there for nine years, and I was interested in reading in the book that he was surprised that although England has given to the people of India freedom of the press, there is not a native journal of influence that defends the English government; and that the ferocity of the people is especially marked among the educated classes. Why, of course, the more educated a man is the more he hates foreign domination. You tell me

that we are going to the Philippine Islands to educate those people? I warn you that if we go there to hold them in subjection, we dare not educate them. If we go there to deny to them the doctrine of self-government, we dare not teach them to read and to think, because they will read our own Declaration of Independence as soon as they can read. If you think that England went to India to educate, let me tell you that after one hundred and fifty years of English domination less than one per cent. of the women of India can read and write, and less than five per cent. of the entire population. If you think she went there to Christianize, let me tell you that after one hundred and fifty years of gunpowder gospel less than one per cent. of the people profess the Christian religion.

No, my friends, you can not advocate imperialism on the ground that it will pay; you can not advocate it on the ground that we go there to educate; but there is an argument that has been urged; I believe it has had more influence than the money argument and that is the religious argument; that God is in it. A Republican Senator said the other day that God opened the door of the Philippine Islands, pushed us in and shut the door. The question that arose in my mind was, who told him so? When a man tells me that it is God's will, I demand to know when God told him so. I want to know when and where the revelation was made, and if he got it from somebody else, I want to know from whom in order that I may demand that man's credentials.

I believe in God; I believe that He influences the thoughts and the purposes of men; but I am not willing to blame God for every thought and every purpose that a man may have. If I feel in my heart

an impulse to do good, I will trace it to God. If I feel in my heart an impulse to do wrong, I will not blame him. If I feel in my heart an impulse to put my hand into my own pocket and take my money and give it to some one in distress, I will trace the impulse to God; but if I feel in my heart an impulse to put my hand into some other person's pocket and take his money, I will not lay it onto the Almighty; there is another old fellow that I will lay it on. I heard of a colored man once who was very fond of chicken, but not always mindful of the commandments; and he said that when he prayed to God to send him a chicken, God seldom did it; but that when he prayed to God to send him after a chicken, he nearly always got it. I believe that the Republican party has prayed to God to send it after the chicken. I believe that it has simply yielded to temptation. Temptations will come. The Bible tells us that nineteen hundred years ago, the devil took the Saviour up on a high mountain and pointed out all the kingdoms of the earth and their glory and offered them to him if he would fall down and worship him; but Christ said, "Get thee behind me, Satan;" but when the Republican leaders were taken up on a high mountain and shown the Philippine Islands, instead of saying, "Get thee behind me, Satan," they hunted up the Spanish monarch, and said, "We will give you \$2.50 apiece for the Filipinos."

I want to denounce this doctrine that God has selected the Republican party to wage in His name a war of conquest. I say I believe in God. I will not deny that there may be prophets to-day. But the trouble is to tell the true prophets from the false ones. The Bible says that false prophets will arise,

and it tells us how to distinguish the false from the true. It says: "By their fruits ye shall know them." And if you want to know whether a man is speaking with the voice of God when he tells you of our benevolent purposes in the Philippine Islands, see if he has acted with the spirit of God in his treatment of the American people. There may be prophets, but you will pardon me if I express it as my deliberate opinion that when God gets ready to speak to the American people he will choose somebody besides Mark Hanna as his mouth-piece.

How are we to find out God's will? From his own word; and I read that when he visited a village of Samaria, and the people refused to receive Him and His disciples wanted to call down fire from Heaven to consume them, Christ rebuked them and said: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. The Son of Man came into the world not to destroy men's lives but to save them." That is the doctrine of the Saviour. Against the infernal doctrine of conquest, I want to place the words of the Master himself, that He came not to destroy but to save.

I read a sermon not long ago, delivered by a man named Brown, in Rochester, N. Y. He took for his text the words which describe the scene where Christ was before Pilate, where Pilate said to him, "Knowest Thou not that I have power to release Thee or to put Thee to death." Taking that text, he contrasted force and love. Pilate represented force; behind him was Cæsar; behind Cæsar was the Roman government, and behind the Roman government were the legions of Rome. Before Pilate, helpless and alone, stood Christ, preaching the gospel of love. And force triumphed. They

nailed him to the tree, and those who believed in the triumph of force stood around and said, "He is dead;" but the minister pointed out from that day the power of Cæsar waned and the power of Christ increased. He pointed out how in a few years the Roman government was gone and its legions forgotten; while the influence of the Master increases with each advancing year, until millions to-day take His name with reverence upon their lips.

And then the minister said that in this nation Pilate and Christ stand face to face, and that upon the decision of this question hangs the question whether this nation will stand before the world as the exponent of brute force or stand as an example of the uplifting power of love. I believe he spoke the truth. I believe that to-day might and right are struggling for the mastery; that to-day reason and force stand face to face, and that upon the decision of this question will hang the question whether this nation will build for eternity or sink to the low level of the nations that have gone to decay. Tell me that you want the glory of empire? Why, for a hundred years this nation has traveled the pathway that leads from the low domain of might to the loftier realm of right, and I would not trade its history for all the glory of all the empires that have risen and fallen since time began.

Tell me you want to be a world power. Why, for more than ten decades this nation has been the most potent influence in the world; for more than a hundred years this nation has done more to affect the politics of the human race than all the other nations of the world together. Here you have witnessed the triumph of an idea. During the closing years

of the eighteenth century this republic was formed; it was dedicated to the doctrine that all men are created equal; that they are endowed with inalienable rights, that governments are instituted to secure those rights, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. During the nineteenth century this idea has grown. Ah, my friends, this idea has been more powerful than all the armies and all the navies of all the monarchies of the earth. And I would not trade this idea for the results of a warfare of conquest. Shall we build upon the doctrine laid down by the fathers, or shall we build upon the shifting sand?

A prominent Republican said the other day that nations may die, whether they expand or not, but that only expanding nations leave a glorious history. I protest against any such doctrine in this nation. There is no reason why a republic should die; a monarchy resting upon force; an empire built upon force will disappear when some greater force arises; but a republic resting upon the doctrine of self-government and administered according to the Jeffersonian motto of equal rights to all and special privileges to none need never die, and will never die.

But they say that we are in it and can not get out. I want to remind you that the people who say we can not get out are the people who led us into the trouble. Tell me that God did it; I tell you that the Republican administration is responsible for every act upon which every argument in favor of permanent retention is based. They say, we must stay in the Philippines, because Dewey destroyed a fleet at Manila? I reply that Schley destroyed one at Santiago. And yet the Republican President

promised the Cubans that we would get out of Cuba. Tell me we must stay in the Philippine Islands because American blood was shed on Philippine soil? I reply that American blood was shed at San Juan Hill and El Caney, and yet the President promised the Cubans that we would get out of Cuba. Tell me that our flag has been raised over the Philippine Islands, and that when once raised it can never come down? I tell you that that flag was raised over Havana a year ago and yet the President told the Cubans that he would haul it down when the flag of the Cuban republic was ready to rise in its place. You can not find an argument for the permanent holding of the Philippine Islands that will not apply to Cuba. When we went into the war we said that the people of Cuba are, and of right, ought to be, free, and I challenge you to draw a line between the rights of the Cubans and the rights of the Filipinos. Did God say that the Cubans are entitled to their freedom and that the Filipinos are not? No, my friends, there is only one difference between Cuba and the Philippine Islands. We promised independence to Cuba, we did not promise it to the Philippine Islands. But our promise was but the recognition of a right that would have existed without the promise. We said that "Cuba is, and of right ought to be, free;" and, if that was a right, then, my friends, it existed in the Philippine Islands without the necessity of an express promise.

But you ask me what could have been done. I say that if the administration in making the treaty had provided for the independence of the Philippines when it provided for the independence of the Cubans there would have been no trouble in the

Philippine Islands. But you say that was not done. I say that if the administration had promised the Filipinos independence on the terms offered to the Cubans there would have been no trouble. But you say the President did not have the right to promise it. I remind you that Congress was in session three months, during which time he could have asked Congress for the authority to make the promise. He not only did not ask the authority, but when the Bacon resolution made the promise all the influence of the Republican administration was brought to bear against it; and with all the influence of the Republican administration the resolution was a tie in the Senate, and it took the Vice-President's vote to defeat it. But you say that, war having broken out, you must now whip the Filipinos before you deal with them. If they have a right to independence there is no humiliation in telling them our purpose in dealing with them. You tell me you must whip them first. I tell you that if you had given them the promise of independence you would not have had to whip them at all; and that if you promise them independence now the war will stop. You ask me what to do. I tell you that the Democratic party for more than a year has been on record on this subject. We say, treat the Filipinos as we promised to treat the Cubans; we told the Cubans that we were fighting not for land but for liberty. Let us tell the Filipinos that having driven the Spaniard out, they are to stand up and be free, and then say to all the world, Hands off, and let that republic live and work out its own destiny. The Republicans ask, would you withdraw the soldiers before order is established? I reply, that if you will tell these people that the gov-

ernment when established is to be their government, and not ours, it will not take many soldiers to restore order. Republicans ask, shall we turn that nation loose to be seized upon by other nations? I say that for nearly a century we have protected the republics of Central and South America, not by governing them, but by announcing to the world that any interference with them, would be considered an act of unfriendliness toward us, and so we can say in a broader sense that when this nation helps a republic to stand upon its feet, the ground whereon that republic stands is holy ground, and that no king shall ever set foot upon that ground again. You tell me that there is a new destiny before this nation. I tell you, my friends, that the nation's destiny is what the nation makes it. If it was the destiny of Cain to slay Abel, it was also his destiny to wear the brand of a murderer forever afterward. It may be the destiny of this nation to turn from its high ideals down to the doctrine of kingdoms and empires, but if that is its destiny it can not be its destiny to be a light unto the world.

Tell me that we are pleading the cause of the Filipinos? No, my friends, we are pleading the cause of the American people. If the Filipinos were to die to-morrow the world would go on; but if this nation ceases to be a republic, the light of civilization goes out. To what nation then could struggling humanity look for hope and inspiration? Oh, my friends, if you want to see the blighting influence of this doctrine upon the conscience of the American people, let me point you to what is going on now down in Southern Africa; a republic is fighting against a monarchy. In every contest heretofore between monarchy and republicanism the

American people have expressed their sympathy. When Greece was struggling to be free Webster and Clay employed their eloquence in defense of a resolution pledging sympathy. When the Cubans were fighting for their liberty all parties declared the sympathy of the American people; but what do we find now? We find that when the English government is attempting to take from the people of the Boer republic the right to govern themselves, the people who believe in imperialism in this country dare not say a word to express their sympathy with the people over there. This is the paralysis that is already creeping over this nation.

My friends, I am no hater of England. In my veins runs English blood as well as Irish and Scotch blood. I do not mean to say one word against any race or any nation; but, my friends, when you tell me that the English government or any government can do anything for this nation that lays it under obligations to forget the principles of our government, I tell you that we have lived without foreign aid for a century and can still live a thousand years without foreign assistance if we are true to our own principles.

If this nation enters upon a career of imperialism it ceases to be a moral factor in the world's progress. If this nation enters upon a career of conquest it is not in position to raise its protest against that doctrine when applied by other nations.

You ask me what my ideal of this nation's destiny is; I tell you that it is to show to the world what self-government can do for a people; it is to make this the greatest republic on earth, the greatest republic of history; and then as we grow in strength, in population and in influence, we can raise our

voice with increasing emphasis, in behalf of truth and justice. I want this nation to stand erect and be able to say at all times that the people in this nation sympathize with anybody who is willing to die for liberty.

But, my friends, pardon me talking so long. I have not been in Baltimore since campaign days. I do not know when I shall be able to talk to the people of this city again. You have come out in such great numbers; you have listened with such attention, and you have encouraged me with such cordial approval, that I have talked longer than I intended to. I want to tell you that the fight for the great fundamental principles of this government as against plutocracy is on. No human being can tell what the result will be. I believe there is a vicious doctrine running through all the Republican policies, and that that vicious doctrine is that the dollar is worth more than the man.

I want, if I can, to help to restore a government founded upon the Declaration of Independence, and administered according to the doctrine of Jefferson; a government that will stand as it did in Jackson's days, between a bank aristocracy and the people.

But, my friends, I can not tell you what fate has decreed. I can not tell you whether it is to be our lot to triumph, and in our triumph lay the foundation again in the old places, and raise again the ancient landmarks which the fathers had set up. I can not tell; but if it is fate that this nation is to cease to be a republic, and become an empire, if it is destiny that this, the greatest republic of history, is to extinguish its light and follow in the lead of the monarchies of the old world; if in the providence of God the time has come for the pendulum

to swing back toward the dark ages and the triumph of brute force, I pray to God that the Democratic party may go down to eternal death with the republic, rather than to live when the doctrine of self-government is abandoned.

CHAPTER VII.

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM J. BRYAN,

DELIVERED AT THE CHICAGO ANTI-TRUST CONFERENCE SEPTEMBER 16, 1899.

The trust principle is not a new principle, but the trust principle is manifesting itself in so many ways and the trusts have grown so rapidly that people now feel alarmed about trusts who did not feel alarmed three years ago. The trust question has grown in importance, because within two years more trusts have been organized, when we come to consider the capitalization and the magnitude of the interests involved, than were organized in all the previous history of the country, and the people now come face to face with this question: Is the trust a blessing or a curse? If a curse, what remedy can be applied to the curse?

x I want to start with the declaration that a monopoly in private hands is indefensible from any standpoint, and intolerable. I make no exceptions to the rule. I do not divide monopolies in private hands into good monopolies and bad monopolies. There is no good monopoly in private hands. There can be no good monopoly in private hands until the Almighty sends us angels to preside over the monopoly. There may be a despot who is better than another despot, but there is no good despotism. One trust may be less harmful than another. One trust magnate may be more benevolent than another, but there is no good monopoly in private hands, and I do not believe it is safe for society to

X permit any man or group of men to monopolize any article of merchandise or any branch of industry.

What is the defense made of the monopoly? The defense of the monopoly is always placed on the ground that if you will allow a few people to control the market and fix the price they will be good to the people who purchase of them. The entire defense of the trusts rests upon a money argument. If the trust will sell to a man an article for a dollar less than the article will cost under other conditions, then in the opinion of some that proves a trust to be a good thing. In the first place X I deny that under a monopoly the price will be reduced. In the second place, if under a monopoly the price is reduced the objections to a monopoly from other standpoints far outweigh any financial advantage that the trust could bring. But I protest in the beginning against settling every question upon the dollar argument. I protest against the attempt to drag every question down to the low level of dollars and cents.

In 1859 Abraham Lincoln wrote a letter to the Republicans of Boston who were celebrating Jefferson's birthday, and in the course of the letter he said: "The Republican party believes in the man and the dollar, but in case of conflict it believes in the man before the dollar." In the early years of his administration he sent a message to Congress, and in that message he warned his countrymen against the approach of monarchy. And what was it that alarmed him? He said it was the attempt to put capital upon an equal footing with, if not above, labor in the structure of government, and in that attempt to put capital even upon an equal footing with labor in the structure of government he saw

the approach of monarchy. Lincoln was right. Whenever you put capital upon an equal footing with labor, or above labor in the structure of government you are on the road toward a government that rests not upon reason but upon force.

Nothing is more important than that we shall in the beginning rightly understand the relation between money and man. Man is the creature of God and money is the creature of man. Money is made to be the servant of man and I protest against all theories that enthrone money and debase mankind.

What is the purpose of the trust or the monopoly? For when I use the word trust I use it in the sense that the trust means monopoly. What is the purpose of monopoly? You can find out from the speeches made by those who are connected with the trusts. I have here a speech made by Charles R. Flint at Boston on the 25th day of last May, and the morning papers of the 26th in describing the meeting said he defended trust principles before an exceedingly sympathetic audience and then added: "For his audience was composed almost exclusively of Boston bankers." "We thus secure," he says, "the advantages of larger aggregations of capital and ability; if I am asked what they are the answer is only difficult because the list is so long."

But I want now to read to you a few of the advantages to be derived by the trusts from the trust system. "Raw material bought in large quantities is secured at lower prices." That is the first advantage. One man to buy wool for all the woolen manufacturers. That means that every man who sells wool must sell it at the price fixed by this one purchaser in the United States. The first thing is

to lower the price of raw material. The great majority of the people are engaged in the production of raw material and in the purchase of finished products. Comparatively few can stand at the head of syndicates and monopolies and secure the profits from them. Therefore, the first advantage of a monopoly is to lower the price of the raw material furnished by the people. Note the next advantage. "Those plants which are best equipped and most advantageously situated are run continuously and in preference to those less favored."

The next thing, after they have bought all the factories, is to close some of them and to turn out of employment the men who are engaged in them. If you will go about over the country you will see where people have subscribed money to establish enterprises, and where these enterprises, having come under the control of the trusts, have been closed and stand now as silent monuments of the trust system.

Behold the next advantage. "In case of local strikes and fires, the work goes on elsewhere, thus preventing serious loss." Do not the laboring men understand what that means? "In case of local strikes or fires the work goes on elsewhere, thus preventing serious loss." What does it mean? It means that if the people employed in one factory are not satisfied with the terms fixed by the employer and strike, the trust can close that factory and let the employes starve while work goes on in other factories without loss to the manufacturers.

It means that when the trust has frozen out the striking employes in one factory and compelled them to return to work at any price to secure bread for their wives and children, it can provoke a strike

somewhere else and freeze the workmen out there. When a branch of industry is entirely in the hands of one great monopoly, so that every skilled man in that industry has to go to the one man for employment, then that one man will fix wages as he pleases and the laboring men will share the suffering of the man who sells the raw materials.

There is no multiplication of the means of distribution and a better force of salesmen takes the place of a large number." That is the next advantage named. I want to warn you that when the monopoly has absolute control, brains will be at a discount, and relatives will be found to fill these positions. When there is competition every employer has to get a good man to meet competition, but when there is no competition anybody can sit in the office and receive letters and answer them because everybody has to write to the same house for anything he wants. There is no question about it. A trust, a monopoly, can lessen the cost of distribution. But when it does so society has no assurance that it will get any of the benefits from that reduction of cost. But you will take away the necessity for skill and brains. You will take away the stimulus that has given to us the quick, the ever alert commercial traveler. These commercial evangelists, who go from one part of the country to the other proclaiming the merits of their respective goods, will not be needed, because when anybody wants merchandise all he has to do is to write to the one man who has the article for sale, and say, "What will you let me have it for to-day?"

And here is another advantage: "Terms and conditions of sale become more uniform and credit can be more safely granted." The trust can not

only fix the price of what it sells, but it can fix the terms upon which it sells. You can pay cash, or, if there is a discount, it is just so much discount, and you have to trust to the manager's generosity as to what is fair when he is on one side and you on the other. I have read some of the advantages which a great trust magnate thinks will come to the trust.

What is the first thing to be expected of a trust? That it will cut down expenses. What is the second? That it will raise prices. We have not had in this country a taste of a complete trust, a complete monopoly, and we can not tell what will be the results of a complete monopoly by looking at the results that have followed from an attempt to secure a monopoly. A corporation may lower prices to rid itself of competitors; but when it has rid itself of competitors, what is going to be the result? My friends, all you have to know is human nature. God made men selfish. I do not mean to say that He made a mistake when He did, because selfishness is merely the outgrowth of an instinct of self-preservation. It is the abnormal development of a man's desire to protect himself; but everybody who knows human nature knows how easy it is to develop that side of a man's being. Occasionally I find a man who says he is not selfish, but when I do, I find a man who can prove it only by his own affidavit.

We get ideas from every source. An idea is the most important thing that a man can get into his head. An idea will control a man's life. An idea will revolutionize a community, a state, a nation, the world. And we never know when we are going to get an idea. Sometimes we get them

when we do not want to get them, and sometimes we get them from sources which would not be expected to furnish ideas. We get them from our fellow men. We get them from inanimate nature. We get them from the animals about us. I got a valuable idea once from some hogs. I was riding through Iowa and saw some hogs rooting in a field. The first thought that came to me was that those hogs were destroying a great deal of value, and then my mind ran back to the time when I lived upon a farm and when we had hogs.

Then I thought of the way in which we used to protect property from the hogs by putting rings in the noses of the hogs; and then the question came to me, why did we do it? NOT to keep the hogs from getting fat, for we were more interested in their getting fat than they were; the sooner they got fat the sooner we killed them; the longer they were in getting fat the longer they lived. But why did we put the rings in their noses? So that while they were getting fat they would not destroy more than they were worth. And then the thought came to me that one of the great purposes of government was to put rings in the noses of hogs. I don't mean to say anything offensive but we are all hoggish. In hours of temptation we are likely to trespass upon the rights of others.

I believe in self-government. I believe in the doctrines that underlie this government; I believe that people are capable of governing themselves. Why? Because in their sober moments they have helped to put rings in their own noses, to protect others from themselves and themselves from others in hours of temptation. And so I believe we must recognize human nature. We must recognize sel-

fishness and we must so make our laws that people shall not be permitted to trespass upon the rights of others in their efforts to secure advantages for themselves.

I believe society is interested in the independence of every citizen. I wish we might have a condition where every adult who died might die leaving to his widow and children enough property for the education of his children and the support of his widow. Society is interested in this because if a man dies and leaves no provisions for his wife and children the burden falls upon society. But while I wish to see every person secure for himself a competency, I don't want him to destroy more than he is worth while he is doing that. And I believe the principle of monopoly finds its inspiration in the desire of men to secure by monopoly what they can not secure in the open field of competition. In other words, if I were going to try to find the root of the monopoly evil I would do as I have often had occasion to do—go back to the Bible for an explanation—and I would find it in the declaration that the love of money is the root of all evil.

I will not ask you all to agree with me; we have not met here as a body of men who agree. We have met here as a body of men who are seeking light and each ought to be willing to hear what every other person has to say, and each of us should desire the triumph of that which is true more than the triumph of that which he may think be true.

Let me repeat that the primary cause of monopoly is the love of money and the desire to secure the fruits of monopoly, but I believe that falling prices, caused by the rising dollar, have contributed to this desire and intensified it, because people, seeing

the fall in prices and measuring the loss of investments, have looked about for some means to protect themselves from this loss, and they have joined in combinations to hold up prices to protect their investments from a loss which would not have occurred but for the rise in the value of dollars and the fall in the level of prices.

Another thing that, in my judgment, has aided monopoly is a high tariff. Nobody can dispute that a high tariff law, an import duty, enables a trust to charge for its product the price of a similar foreign product plus the tariff.

Now some have suggested that to put everything on the free list that trusts make would destroy the trusts. I do not agree with this statement as it is made so broadly. I believe that the high tariff has been the means of extortion and that it has aided trusts to collect more than they otherwise could collect. But I do not believe you could destroy all trusts by putting all trust-made articles on the free list. Why? Because, if an article can be produced in this country as cheaply as it could be produced abroad the trust could exist without the aid of any tariff, although it could not extort so much as it could with the tariff. While some relief may come from modifications of the tariff, we can not destroy monopoly until we lay the axe at the root of the tree and make monopoly impossible by law.

It has been suggested that discrimination by railroads has aided the trusts. No question about it. If one man can secure from a railroad better rates than another man, he will be able to run the other man out of business; and there is no question that discrimination and favoritism secured by one

corporation against a rival have been largely instrumental in enabling the favored corporation to secure practically a complete monopoly. Now that can be remedied by laws that will prevent this discrimination, but when we prevent the discrimination, when we place every producer upon the same footing and absolutely prevent favoritism, monopoly may still exist. The remedy must go farther. It must be complete enough to prevent the organization of a monopoly.

Now what can be done to prevent the organization of a monopoly? I think we differ more in remedy than we do in our opinion of the trust. I venture the opinion that few people will defend monopoly as a principle, or a trust organization as a good thing, but I imagine our great difference will be as to remedy, and I want, for a moment, to discuss the remedy.

We have a dual form of government. We have a state government and a federal government, and while this dual form of government has its advantages, and to my mind advantages which can hardly be overestimated, yet it also has its disadvantages. When you prosecute a trust in the United States court it hides behind state sovereignty, and when you prosecute it in the state court it rushes to cover under federal jurisdiction—and we have had some difficulty in prosecuting a remedy.

I believe we ought to have remedies in both state and nation, and that they should be concurrent remedies. In the first place, every state has, or should have, the right to create any private corporation which in the judgment of the people of the state is conducive to the welfare of the people of that state. I believe we can safely intrust to the

people of a state the settlement of a question which concerns them. If they create a corporation and it becomes destructive of their best interests they can destroy that corporation, and we can safely trust them both to create and annihilate if conditions make annihilations necessary. In the second place the state has, or should have, the right to prohibit any foreign corporation from doing business in the state, and it has or should have the right to impose such restrictions and limitations as the people of the state may think necessary upon foreign corporations doing business in the state. In other words, the people of the state not only should have a right to create the corporations they want, but they should be permitted to protect themselves against any outside corporation.

But I do not think this is sufficient. I believe, in addition to a state remedy, there must be a federal remedy, and I believe Congress has, or should have, the power to place restrictions and limitations, even to the point of prohibition, upon any corporation organized in any state that wants to do business outside of the state. I say that Congress has, or should have, power to place upon the corporation such limitations and restrictions, even to the point of prohibition, as may to Congress seem necessary for the protection of the public.

Now I believe that these concurrent remedies will prove effective. To repeat, the people of every state shall first decide whether they want to create a corporation; they shall also decide whether they want any outside corporation to do business in the state, and, if so, upon what conditions; and then Congress shall exercise the right to place upon every corporation doing business outside of the state

in which it is organized such limitations and restrictions as may be necessary for the protection of the public.

I do not believe that the people of one state can rely upon the people of another state in the management of corporations. And I will give you a reason. I have here a letter that was sent out by a Delaware corporation with an office in New York. It is a most remarkable document, the most remarkable document on this subject that has ever fallen under my observation. We have talked about the state of New Jersey having a law favorable to trusts. I have a letter here which shows that in Delaware they adopted a law for the purpose of making Delaware more friendly to the trusts than New Jersey. Let me read the letter. It is a little long, but it will repay reading.

“The state of Delaware has just adopted the most favorable of existing general corporation laws, one marking a forward step in the evolution of corporations. It does not encourage reckless incorporation nor permit the existence of wild-cat companies, but it furnishes at the least expense ample rights to stockholders and reduces restrictions upon corporate action to the minimum. The enactment is not the result, as in the case of most states, of hesitating, halting, enacting, amending and repealing, but is a logical and systematic measure framed by a committee of able lawyers appointed by the legislature to examine the various statutes of the various states and prepare a bill which should embody the good and eliminate the bad points of existing law. The law is based broadly upon that of the state of New Jersey and embraces all the beneficial provisions and safeguards found in the

laws of that state. It has, however, in many respects advanced far beyond New Jersey, and makes Delaware a much more attractive home for business corporations. In the following salient provisions the Delaware and New Jersey laws are substantially identical, namely: Any three persons may organize a corporation; second, it may engage in any lawful business excepting banking; third, its existence may be perpetual or limited; fourth, it may purchase and deal in real or personal property wherever situated and to any desired amount. Fifth, it may be a mortgagee or mortgagor; sixth, it may conduct business anywhere in the world; seventh, stock may be issued for property purchased (and in Delaware for services rendered) and in the absence of fraud the judgment of the directors as to the value of such property or services is conclusive; eighth, it may easily wind up its affairs and dissolve itself; ninth, its authorized capital stock need not be more than \$2,000 and only \$1,000 of this need be subscribed for; tenth, the amount of capital stock which it may issue is unlimited; eleventh, it may file its certificate of incorporation and even commence business before any sum whatever is paid in; twelfth, it may have different classes of stock, with different privileges or restrictions; thirteenth, the charter may be easily amended; fourteenth, only one director need be a resident of Delaware; fifteenth, the capital stock may be easily diminished or increased; sixteenth, the corporation may be readily merged or consolidated into other corporations; seventeenth, it may own and vote upon the stock of other corporations; eighteenth, the incorporators may or may not limit the authority of the directors as to the liabilities.

"The Delaware law possesses the following decided advantages: First, the original fee to be paid for incorporation is small—about three-fourths of that in New Jersey, for instance; second, the annual tax is very small, one-half that in New Jersey. Delaware is a small state and does not need a very large revenue. Third, stockholders and directors may hold their meetings wherever they please and need never meet in the state of Delaware. (New Jersey stockholders must meet in that state.) You see it is a decided advantage over the New Jersey law in that respect. Fourth, the original stock and transfer books (which in a New Jersey corporation must be kept in the state), may be kept in or out of Delaware in the discretion of the company. Fifth, the examination of the books by intermeddlers is much more difficult under the Delaware law than under the laws of any other state.

"Sixth, the liability of the stockholders is absolutely limited when the stock has once been issued for cash, property or services. Seventh, stock may be issued in compensation for services rendered and in the absence of fraud in the transaction the judgment of the directors as to the value of such services is conclusive. (In New Jersey authority is given to issue stock for property, but not for service.) Eighth, for certain important classes of corporations, as, for instance, railroads, railway, telegraph, cable, electric light, steam heating, power, gas piping lines and sleeping car companies, the advantage is still more marked."

I wish we had some way of knowing what the additional advantages are after having read the ordinary advantages.

"Ninth, the annual report of a Delaware corporation is required to give no secret or confidential information.

"Tenth, the certificate need not show nor need public record be in any way made of the amount of stock subscribed by any incorporator."

And then the letter adds: "This company is authorized to act as the agent and trustee of corporations organized under the Delaware law. It will maintain the principal office of the company in Delaware and keep an agent in charge within the state. It is formed for the purpose of facilitating the incorporation of companies in Delaware and of aiding them to comply, at a minimum expense, with the requirements of the Delaware law. We are ready to aid and give full information to incorporators or their counsel. We do not interfere between attorney and client. We do not conduct a law business. Copies of the Delaware law, blank forms of information concerning Delaware corporations furnished on application.

"All communications to us are confidential."

A voice from the gallery—Colonel, Delaware and New Jersey are both democratic states, are they not?

Mr. Bryan—They were not in 1896.

Another voice from the gallery—Has the gentleman any more questions to put?

Mr. Bryan—I am very glad to have questions asked, because we are seeking the truth.

I have read you this letter in order to show you that where a state can gain an advantage from the incorporation of these great aggregations of wealth, it is not safe to place the people of other states at the tender mercies of the people of such a state as may

desire to collect its running expenses from the taxation of corporations organized to prey upon people outside.

I read the letter to show how impossible it is for the people of one state to depend for protection upon the people in another state; and while, as I say, I believe the people of every state should have the power to create corporations and to restrain, to limit, and, if necessary, to annihilate, yet I believe that no complete remedy will be found for the trust until the federal government, with a power sufficiently comprehensive to reach into every nook and corner of the country, lays its hands upon these trusts and declares that they shall no longer exist.

I am here to hear, to receive information and to adopt any method that anybody can propose that looks to the annihilation of the trusts.

One method has occurred to me, and to me it seems a complete method. It may not commend itself to you. If you have something better I shall accept it in the place of this which I am about to suggest. But the method that occurs to me is this: That Congress should pass a law providing that no corporation organized in any state should do business outside of the state in which it is organized until it receives from some power created by Congress a license authorizing it to do business outside of its own state. Now, if the corporation must come to this body created by Congress to secure permission to do business outside of the state, then the license can be granted upon conditions which will, in the first place, prevent the watering of stock; in the second place, prevent monopoly in any branch of business, and, third, provide for publicity as to all of the transactions and business of the corporation.

A voice—Colonel, would such a law be constitutional?

Mr. Bryan—I was going to come to that. I am glad you mentioned it. What I mean to say is that Congress ought to pass such a law. If it is unconstitutional and so declared by the supreme court, I am in favor of an amendment to the constitution that will give to Congress power to destroy every trust in the country. The first condition which I suggest is that no water should be allowed in the stock. I do not agree with those who say it is a matter entirely immaterial whether a corporation has water in its stock or not. It may be true that in the long run, if you are able to run as long as the corporation can, the stock will fall to its natural level, but during all that time the harm goes on; during all that time the trust demands the right to collect dividends upon capital represented by no money whatever. I do not believe that any state should permit the organization of a corporation with a single drop of water in the stock of that corporation. The farmer can not inflate the value of his land by watering the value of that land. The merchant in the store can not inflate the value of the goods upon his shelves. Why should the corporation be permitted to put out stock that represents no real value?

INSTANCES OF WATERED STOCK.

Why, there are instances where there are \$4 of water for \$1 of money.

A voice—Seven.

Mr. Bryan—Yes, a man suggests seven. Do I hear a higher bid? I have known it to be twelve—but I am a conservative man, and I must maintain

my reputation. No man can defend stock that does not represent money invested, and only in the case of a monopoly can you secure dividends upon stock that does not represent money invested.

We had a law in Nebraska that was intended to regulate railroad rates. One railroad in our state was capitalized and bonded for more than five times what it would cost to duplicate the road, and yet the judge held that in fixing rates and in determining what was fair compensation for the railroad we had to consider the watered stock as well as the actual value of that road, and when the case went to the supreme court, the supreme court rendered a decision which, while I can not quote its exact language, was in substance this: That in determining what was a reasonable rate we had to take into consideration a number of things besides the present value of that road, measured by the cost of reproduction. If the watering of the stock is permitted, then the cry of the innocent purchaser is raised, and you will be told that you must protect the man who bought this stock. No man ought to stand in the position of an innocent purchaser who buys stock in a corporation if that stock does not represent actual money invested, because he can find out what the stock stands for if he will only investigate, but, as a matter of fact, the holders of watered stock are able to collect dividends. Now, if this license is granted, then the first condition can be that any corporation desiring to do business outside of the state in which it is organized shall bring to that board or body proof that that stock is bona fide, and that there is no water in it. In my judgment, when you take from monopoly the power to issue stock not represented by money, you will go more

than half the way toward destroying monopoly in the United States.

The law should provide for publicity. As has been well said by men who have spoken here, corporations can not claim that they have a right, or that it is necessary, to cover their transactions with secrecy, and when you provide for publicity so that the public can know just what there is in the corporation, just what it is doing, and just what it is making, you will take another long step toward the destruction of monopoly.

But I am not willing to stop there. I do not want to go one or two steps, I want to go all the way and make a monopoly absolutely impossible. And, therefore, as a third condition, I suggest that this license shall not be granted until the corporation shows that it has not had a monopoly and is not attempting a monopoly of any branch of industry or of any article of merchandise—and then provide that if the law is violated the license can be revoked. I do not believe in the government giving privileges to be exercised by a corporation without reserving the right to withdraw them when those privileges become hurtful to the people. Now, I may be mistaken, but as I have studied the subject, it has seemed to me that this method of dealing with the trusts would prove an effective method, but if you once establish the system and require the license, then Congress can, from year to year, add such new conditions as may be necessary for the protection of the public from the greed and avarice of great aggregations of wealth. I do not go so far as some do and say that there shall be no private corporations, but I say this, that a corporation is created by law, that it is created for the

public good, and that it should never be permitted to do a thing that is injurious to the public, and that if any corporation enjoys any privileges to-day which are hurtful to the public those privileges ought to be withdrawn from it. In other words, I am willing that we should first see whether we can preserve the benefits of the corporation and take from it its possibilities for harm.

A delegate—Would you apply that to rich individuals also, suppose Rockefeller did it on his own account?

Mr. Bryan—We have not reached a point yet where an individual has been able to do harm, and, in my judgment, if we would abolish those laws that grant special privileges and make some men the favorites of the government, no man, by his own brains and muscle, could ever earn enough money to be harmful to the people.

A delegate—What will you say to the banks reporting five hundred millions of money in the vaults and four billions of loans?

Mr. Bryan—Well, I would say it would not be safe to have all the loans collected at once.

Following out the suggestion the gentleman has made, I want to add to what I have said to this extent: My contention is that we have been placing the dollar above the man; that we have been picking out favorites and bestowing upon them special privileges, and every advantage we have given them has been given them to the detriment of other people. My contention is that there is a vicious principle running through the various policies which we have been pursuing; that in our taxation we have been imposing upon the great struggling masses, the burden of government, while we have



Chas. A. Downey



B. R. Tillman

been voting the privileges to a few people who will not pay their share of the expenses of the government.

Every unjust tax law is an indirect form of larceny. If, for instance, a man who ought to pay \$10 only pays \$5, and one who ought to pay only \$5 pays \$10, the law that compels this contribution from these two men virtually takes \$5 from one man's pocket and puts that \$5 into the other man's pocket, and I have claimed that when we collected our taxes we were making the poor people pay not only their own share, but the share of the men whom they have no chance to meet at the summer resorts. I have been gratified to note the progress that you have been making in Illinois, towards more equitable distribution of the burdens of government. I heard it stated that there was a time only a few years ago when the agricultural implements owned by the farmers living within the city limits of Chicago were assessed for more than all the money in Chicago returned for taxation by private citizens. I do not know whether it was true or not, but I saw it stated as a fact. There are some people who have visible property, others who have invisible property, and the visible property is always taxed. The invisible property has too often escaped and, as a result the people owning visible property have not only paid their own taxes, but the taxes that should have been paid by the owners of invisible property. I have advocated an income tax because I believe it the most just tax. I do not mention it to argue the question here because I want to avoid the discussion of any questions that might be considered partisan. If the government will quit picking out favorites and follow the doctrine of equal rights to all and

special privileges to no man—I have no fear that any man by his own brain or his own muscle will be able to secure a fortune so great as to be a menace to the welfare of his fellow men. If we secure a government whose foundations are laid in justice and laws exemplifying the doctrine of equality before the law, if we can secure such a government and such laws, and wealth is then accumulated to a point where it becomes dangerous, we can meet that question when it arises, and I am willing to trust the wisdom of society to meet every question that arises and remedy every wrong.

Sigmund Zeisler—What will you do, colonel, with the multi-millionaires that already exist? Suppose they should hold and acquire all the industries, all the factories, and particularly industries?

Colonel Bryan—Do you mean before our laws go into operation?

Mr. Zeisler—The multi-millionaires that already exist.

Colonel Bryan—In the first place, private individuals have not been able to secure monopolies, and are not likely to do so. As to the multi-millionaires now in existence, I would wait and see whether they would die off soon enough to relieve the country of danger. Life is short. If, however, their accumulations should become a menace, I would then consider what measures would be necessary for the protection of society. And this brings me to what I regard as a very important branch of this subject. I am glad the question was asked; it calls attention to the difference between an individual and a corporation. Every trust rests upon a corporation—at least that rule is so nearly universal that I think we can accept it as a basis for legisla-

tion. Every trust rests upon a corporation, and every corporation is a creature of law. The corporation is a man-made man.

When God made man as the climax of creation, he looked upon his work and said that it was good, and yet when God finished his work, the tallest man was not much taller than the shortest, and the strongest man was not much stronger than the weakest. That was God's plan. We looked upon his work and said that it was not quite as good as it might be, and so we made a fictitious person called a corporation that is in some instances a hundred times—a thousand times—a million times stronger than the God-made man. Then we started this man-made giant out among the God-made men. When God made man he placed a limit to his existence, so that if he was a bad man he could not do harm long, but when we made our man-made man we raised the limit as to age. In some states a corporation is given perpetual life.

When God made man he breathed into him a soul and warned him that in the next world he would be held accountable for the deeds done in the flesh, but when we made our man-made man we did not give him a soul, and if he can avoid punishment in this world he need not worry about the hereafter.

My contention is that the government that created must retain control, and that the man-made man must be admonished: "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth" and throughout thy entire life.

Let me call your attention again to this distinction. We are not dealing with the natural man; we are not dealing with natural rights. We are

dealing with the man-made man and artificial privileges.

What government gives the government can take away. What the government creates it can control, and I insist that both the state government and the federal government must protect the God-made man from the man-made man. I have faith that these questions will be settled and settled right, but I want to protest against this doctrine that the trust is a natural outgrowth of natural laws. It is not true. This trust is the natural outgrowth of unnatural conditions created by man-made laws. There are some who would defend everything, good or bad, on the ground that it is destiny—and that you cannot inquire into it. The fact that it is, proves that it is right; the fact that it is, proves that it has come to stay, and the argument most frequently made in defence of a vicious system is not that it is right and ought to stay, but that it has come to stay whether you like it or not. I say that that is the argument that is usually advanced in behalf of an error—it is here, it has come to stay—what are you going to do about it?

I believe that, in a civilized society the question is not what is, but what ought to be—and that every proposition must be arraigned at the bar of reason. If you can prove that a thing is good, let it stay, but if you cannot prove that it is good you cannot hide behind the assertion that it is here and that you cannot get rid of it. I believe that the American people can get rid of anything that they do not want—and that they ought to get rid of everything that is not good. I believe that it is the duty of every citizen to give to his countrymen the benefit of his conscience and his judgment, and cast his in-

fluence, be it small or great, upon the right side of every question that arises. In the determination of questions we should find out what will make our people great and good and strong rather than what will make them rich. "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches." Shall we decide the ethics of larceny by discussing how much the man is going to steal or the chances of his getting caught? No, my friends, we must decide questions upon a higher ground, and if you were to prove to me that a monopoly would reduce the price of the articles that we have to purchase, I would still be opposed to it for a reason, which to my mind overshadows all pecuniary arguments. The reason is this: Put the industrial system of this nation in the hands of a few men, and let them determine the price of raw material, the price of the finished product and the wages paid to labor, and you will have an industrial aristocracy besides which a landed aristocracy would be an innocent thing.

I may be in error, but, in my judgment, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, will be impossible when a few men control all the sources of production and dole out daily bread to all the rest on such terms as the few may prescribe. I believe that this nation is the hope of the world. I believe that the Declaration of Independence was the grandest document ever penned by human hands. The truths of that declaration are condensed into four great propositions: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed with inalienable rights; that governments are instituted among men to preserve those rights, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Such a government is

impossible under an industrial aristocracy. Place the food and clothing, all that we eat and wear and use, in the hands of a few people, and instead of it being a government of the people it will be a government of the syndicates, by the syndicates, and for the syndicates. Establish such a government, and the people will soon be powerless to secure a legislative remedy for any abuse. Establish such a system, and on the night before election the employees will be notified not to come back on the day after election unless the trusts' candidate is successful. Establish such a government, and instead of giving the right of suffrage to the people, you will virtually give the right of suffrage to the heads of monopolies, with each man empowered to vote as many times as he has employees. I am not willing to place the laboring men of this country absolutely at the mercy of the heads of monopolies. I am not willing to place the men who produce the raw material absolutely in the hands of the monopolies, because when you control the price that a man is to receive for what he produces you control the price that he is to receive for his labor in the production of that thing.

The farmer has no wages except as wages are measured by the price of his product, and when you place it in the power of the trust to fix the price of what the farmer sells, you place it in the power of the trust to lower the wages that the farmer receives for his work, and when you place it in the power of the trust to raise the price of what he buys, you do the farmer a double injury, because he burns the candle at both ends and suffers when he sells to the trust and again when he buys of the trust.

Some people have tried to separate the laboring man who works in the factory from the laboring man who works on the farm. I want to warn the laboring men in the factories that they can not separate themselves from those who toil on the farm without inviting their own destruction. I beg the laboring men in the factories not to join with the monopolies to crush the farmer, for as soon as the farmer is crushed the laboring man will be crushed, and in a test of endurance the farmer will stand it longer than the laboring man.

I come from an agricultural state, one of the great agricultural states of this nation, and I want to say to you that while our people are, I believe, a unit against the trusts, we can stand the trusts longer than the laboring man can; we can stand all the vicious policies of government longer than the laboring man can. The farmer was the first man on the scene when civilization began, and he will be the last one to disappear. The farmer wants to own his home; he ought to own it. I think that this nation is safer the larger the proportion of home owners. I want every man with a family to own his home, the farmer wants to own his home, but if you will not allow him to own his home he can rent. He will have to be employed to work the farm. Take his farm from him by mortgage if you like, but the man who forecloses the mortgage and buys the property will not work the farm. He will need the farmer to work for him, and he will have to give the farmer enough to live on, or the farmer cannot work. When prices fall so low that the farmer cannot buy coal, he can burn corn. But when prices fall so low that the coal miner cannot buy corn, he cannot eat coal. You can drive the

farmer down so that he cannot buy factory made goods, but his wife can do like the wife of old—make the clothing for the family off of the farm, but when you close your factories it will take all the accumulated wealth of the cities to feed the people brought to the point of starvation by vicious, greedy, avaricious legislation.

But, my friends, why should we try to see who can hold out the longest in suffering? Why try to see who can endure the most hardships and yet live? Why not try to see who can contribute most to the greatness and to the glory and to the prosperity of this nation? Why not vie with each other to see who can contribute most to make this government what the fathers intended it to be. For 100 years this nation has been the light of the world. For 100 years the struggling people of all nations have looked to this nation for hope and inspiration. Let us settle these great questions; let us teach the world the blessing of a government that comes from the people, let us show them how happy and how prosperous people can be. God made all men, and He did not make some to crawl on hands and knees and others to ride upon their backs. Let us show what can be done when we put into actual practice the great principles of human equality and of equal rights. Then this nation will fulfill its holy mission and lead the other nations step by step in the progress of the human race toward a higher civilization.

SECOND SPEECH.

I would not occupy the time again but for the fact that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Foulke) has referred to a plan which I suggested, and I am afraid that he does not fully understand it.

Just a word in regard to the plan. I want to repeat that it was not presented as the only plan, nor is it necessarily the best plan. It is simply a plan. I was sorry that, when the gentleman got through destroying this plan, he did not suggest a better one. Political agnosticism is of no great benefit to the public. Not to know what to do is often a convenient position to occupy, but it contributes very little to the settlement of a question.

My plan is this: First, that the state has, or should have, the right to create whatever private corporations the people of the state desire.

Second, that the state has, or should have, the right to impose such limitations upon an outside corporation as the people of the state may think necessary for their own protection. That protects the right of the people of the state to say, first, what corporations they shall organize in their state, and second, what corporations they shall permit to come from other states to do business in their state.

Third, that the federal government has, or should have, the right to impose such restrictions as Congress may think necessary upon any corporation which does business outside of the state in which it is organized.

In other words, I would preserve to the people of the state all the rights that they now have, and at the same time have Congress exercise a concurrent remedy to supplement the state remedy. When the federal government licenses a corporation to do business outside of the state in which it was organized it merely permits it to do business in any state, under the conditions imposed by that state, in addition to the conditions imposed by the federal government. I would not take away from the

people of the state any right now existing, but I would have the federal government and the state government exercise the powers that may be necessary to annihilate every monopoly.

I do not agree with the gentleman that you cannot annihilate a monopoly. I believe it is possible to do so. While the gentleman was speaking I could not help thinking of the lines of a song. While he was destroying every remedy suggested, and yet presenting no other, I thought of the lines:

Plunged in a gulf of deep despair,
Ye wretched sinners lie.

Now, it is a great deal easier to find fault with a remedy proposed than to propose a remedy which is faultless. Macaulay—I think he is the author of the remark—has said that if any money was to be made by disputing the law of gravitation, able men could be found to write articles against the truth of that law: I have no doubt that any remedy that is proposed will be assaulted. But those who believe that the trusts must go will accept the best remedy they can find, try it, and then accept a better one, if a better one is proposed, and keep on trying until the people are protected.

Now, this is a conference. We have not met here to destroy the trusts. Every law for the annihilation of the trusts must be secured through political action. We are here to discuss these questions. We are here to contribute what we can and to hear what others have to say. We are here to consider the various remedies proposed. I am not sure the remedy which I propose is unconstitutional. I am not sure that the constitution would prohibit such an act of Congress as I suggest. Suppose that Congress should say that whenever a corporation want

to do business outside of the state it must apply to and receive from some body, created by Congress for the purpose, a license to do business. Suppose the law should provide three conditions upon which the license could be issued:

1. That the evidence should show that there is no water in the stock.

2. That the evidence should show that the corporation has not attempted in the past, and is not now attempting, to monopolize any branch of industry or any article of merchandise; and

3. Providing for that publicity which everybody has spoken of and about which everybody agrees.

Suppose that is done. Who is here to say that such a law would be unconstitutional? The supreme court in deciding the Knight case, did not say that a broader law than the present one would be unconstitutional. It is true there are things in the decision which suggest that, but until that question is presented to the court you cannot say that the court has passed upon it. It is also true that Justice Harlan, in his dissenting opinion, assumed that a broader law would be held unconstitutional, but no one has a right to say that if such a law as I suggest were passed and reviewed by the supreme court it would be held unconstitutional. But, suppose the law is passed and held unconstitutional; then we can amend the constitution.

The gentleman suggests that it is a difficult thing to get two-thirds of both houses and three-fourths of the states to favor such an amendment. That is true; it is a difficult thing, but if the people want to destroy the trusts they can control two-thirds of both houses and three-fourths of the states. But what is the alternative? Sit down and do nothing?

Allow them to trample upon you, ride rough-shod over you, and then thank God that you still have some life left? The people are told to be contented, but I think contentment may be carried too far.

I heard a man once who had been taught to be contented with his lot, and finally became very poor and traded off his coat for a loaf of bread. Before he had a chance to eat the bread, a dog came along and snatched it away from him. He felt a little indignant at first, but finally that feeling of contentment came back to him, and as he watched the dog turn around a corner in the road carrying the bread away, he said: "Well, thank God, I still have my appetite left."

Now, there are some people who seem to think we ought to be satisfied with anything. My friends the American people are entitled to the best that there is. The American people are entitled to the best system on every subject. I believe when these questions are presented to the American people they will select and secure the best system. I do not believe it necessary for us to sit down quietly and permit a great aggregation of wealth to strangle every competitor. I do not believe that it is in accordance with our dignity as a people, or in accordance with the rights of the people to say, that because a great corporation is organized, therefore, it should be permitted to go into the field of a rival, undersell it until it bankrupts it, raising the money by higher prices somewhere else. I don't think it necessary for us to do that.

I have only suggested a plan. It may not be the best plan. If you have anything better, propose it. If there is any amendment that you can think of

that will improve it, suggest it. I am anxious to apply a remedy.'

Let me suggest one other thing that I believe will be a step in the right direction. The great trouble has been that, while our platforms denounce corporations, corporations control the elections and place the men who are elected to enforce the law under obligations to them.

Let me propose a remedy—not a remedy, but a step in the right direction. Let the laws, state and national, make it a penal offence for any corporation to contribute to the campaign fund of any political party. Nebraska has such a law, passed two years ago. Tennessee has such a law, passed two years ago. Such a measure was introduced in the state of New York, but so far it has not become a law.

You remember the testimony taken before a senate committee a few years ago, when the head of the sugar trust testified that the sugar trust made it its business to contribute to campaign funds, and when asked to which one it contributed, replied that it depended upon circumstances.

“To which fund do you contribute in Massachusetts?” was asked. “To the republican fund.” “To which fund in New York?” “To the democratic fund.” “To which fund in New Jersey?” and the man replied, “Well, I will have to look at the books, that is a doubtful state.”

Now, that is almost a literal reproduction of the testimony of one great corporation on the subject of campaign contribution. I don't mean to say that that remedy will be a complete one, but I believe that when you prevent a corporation from contributing to campaign funds you will make it easier

to secure remedial legislation, because some corporations are compelled to contribute; they are blackmailed into contributions, and such a law would protect a corporation that did not want to contribute, and also prevent a corporation from contributing that did want to contribute.

If the people are in earnest they can destroy monopoly, and you never can do anything in this country until the people are in earnest. When the American people understand what the monopoly question means, I believe there will be no power, political, financial or otherwise, to prevent the people from taking possession of every branch of government, from president to the supreme court, and making the government responsive to the people's will.

CHAPTER VIII.

NATIONAL SILVER REPUBLICANS.

The first national convention of the National Silver Republican Party was held at Kansas City, Mo., July 4, 1900. Twenty-four states and territories were represented, especially large delegations being seated from Kansas, Nebraska, Minnesota, Iowa and Colorado. Other states represented were Arkansas, California, Illinois, Indiana, Indian Territory, Idaho, Michigan, Montana, Missouri, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, New Jersey, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Utah and West Virginia.

Chairman Charles A. Towne called the meeting to order at 12 o'clock; prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. Bigelow, of Cincinnati, after which Stanley E. Parkhill, of Minnesota, read the Declaration of Independence; a poem entitled "The Liberty Bell" was delivered by Dr. Howard S. Taylor, of Chicago. Chairman Towne delivered a short address congratulating the party upon the large attendance of delegates, and dwelling especially upon the growth of the party since the organization was effected four years ago.

He then introduced Senator Henry M. Teller, of Colorado, as the temporary chairman of the convention. Every delegate jumped to his feet and shouted his approval. Mr. Towne presented Senator Teller with a gavel made from wood taken from the old Lincoln home at Springfield, Ill., which was given to the convention by

Lincoln Dubois, of Illinois. Senator Teller spoke in part as follows:

"Grave questions are presented to the American people for their consideration and determination in the coming campaign. Questions of foreign and domestic policies growing out of or incident to the last Spanish war have especially attracted the attention of the people during the last two years, and will continue to do so. Questions new to us and involving much to others as well as ourselves cannot be readily disposed of, but great as these questions are, they must not and will not be allowed to obscure the great and still unsettled question, 'What shall be the financial system of the republic?'

"I say still unsettled question, because no great economic question can be settled until it is settled in a way to do justice to all. We do not believe the action of a republican administration in establishing the gold standard, with a carefully prepared plan to destroy the greenbacks, treasury notes, silver certificates and silver dollars, and to turn over to the national banks the issue of all paper money that the commercial needs of the people may demand, meets with the approbation of the people. The people believe that gold and silver coins are the money of the constitution, and that if paper money is to be issued it should bear the stamp of the government and have back of it the wealth and power of the nation, and not that of a private corporation.

"The republican party is now declaring that it kept all the promises made at St. Louis by establishing the gold standard. It did not promise at St. Louis to establish the gold standard; if it had done so it would not now be in power. It promised to maintain the then existing gold standard, a very different thing from the present gold standard. The party has not kept its promise and has not made good its pledges as to the financial system of the country. On the contrary, it has done what its opponents declared it would do and its supporters declared it would not do.

"The republican party has thrown off the mask and no longer pretends to favor even international bimetalism. It is well that it should do so, for the pledge of 1896 was made to secure votes, as was frankly admitted by leading Republicans as soon as the campaign was over. The speakers at Philadelphia, in nominating their candidates, gloried in the gold standard, and claimed as one of their great achievements the destruction of silver as money.

"The republican party boasts of its financial system that makes gold the standard of value, as calculated to promote business enterprises and maintain stability of prices and financial conditions, and yet the secretary of the treasury has found it necessary to put more than \$100,000,000 of the public money collected from the people in the national banks of the country, to be used by the banks without interest. Surely a system that must be bolstered up by the government of the United States by deposits of its funds cannot be a satisfactory system. The administration justifies such use of the public moneys by declaring that such deposits must be made to sustain prices and prevent a panic.

"The Republicans boast that they have reduced the war debt \$40,000,000; they fail to mention the fact that they have increased the national bonded debt \$200,000,000 before they attempted to reduce it. Nor did they mention the fact that they are collecting an internal revenue from the people, nearly if not quite, \$150,000,000 a year more than any other administration did in time of peace.

"If the increased exports of 1898 and 1899 are the result of tariff laws, why is it that under republican tariff laws administered by Republicans from 1861 to 1875 inclusive, there were only two years when there was a surplus of exports over imports, and the aggregate of such surplus was only about \$20,000,000, while the aggregate imports was \$1,200,000,000 in excess of exports? Why did they not mention the fact that the net exports of 1897 were \$286,000,000 and that this occurred under the Wilson bill? Why did they not tell us that in 1888 and in 1889, under a republican tariff law, our imports exceeded our exports by over \$30,000,000?

"It is a well known fact that our large increase of exports during the last three years arises from a demand for food products caused by short crops in most European countries, India and South America, and that our exports would not have been less under the Wilson bill or under a democratic administration. It is possible that under the Wilson bill we might have bought more foreign products than under the Dingley bill, but it is hardly probable that buying less would enable us to sell more.

"When it becomes necessary to sustain the prices they have fixed, the trusts close their factories, reduce their output and turn their laborers into the street to secure employment elsewhere if they can, and if not able to do that to starve.

"With a power more than imperial they fix the price of their product and the price of the labor that enters into the creation of the product, and create a scarcity or a surplus as their interests demand, without consideration of the rights or interests of the laborer or consumer. Demanding for themselves the full protection of the laws of the land, they bid defiance to all and every law enacted to compel them to deal justly with their employees and consumers.

"With a United States statute for their control declared by the highest court of the land to be constitutional, the republican attorney-general declares that the great trusts are beyond the power of the courts and cannot be restrained in their work of spoliation of the public. These great trusts find their only defenders in the ranks of the republican party. Many republican officials do not hesitate to declare that trusts are the natural evolution of trade, and are a national blessing, and they resist all efforts for their control as an unjustifiable interference with trade.

"With both branches of congress under their control, with considerable majorities, the only remedy proposed is a constitutional amendment to give congress more complete powers over them, ostensibly for their better control, but in reality to release the trusts from the authority of the states to deal with them. It is certain no honest effort has been made by the party in power to control the

trusts or in any way mitigate their pernicious influence, nor will such effort be made by that party in the future.

"Who ever heard before that when a citizen of the United States exports goods to a country not a part of the United States the government of the United States can put a duty on such goods when they are received in such foreign land? But if Porto Rico is a part of the United States, who will point out the authority for the laying of a duty on goods going from one part of the United States to another? If Porto Rico is a part of the United States, the duty on goods going into Porto Rico is an illegal tax. And it is equally illegal if Porto Rico is a foreign land, for it is in effect an export duty which is forbidden by the constitution.

"In the nature of things it is not to be expected that a party can be found that on all subjects will be in accord with former Republicans who can no longer support that party; but in the democratic party, with its liberal ideas expressed in the platform of 1896, and to be again repeated, together with their disapproval of imperialism and trusts, we may, I believe, fully discharge our duty as American citizens by the support of that party. I feel assured that with Mr. Bryan's nomination and election will come a better condition of administration in all departments of the government—a better hope for the masses; better opportunities for struggling labor and liberty to our own people and all that are within our jurisdiction in the islands of the seas."

The first mention of Mr. Bryan's name came near the end of Chairman Teller's speech. It started a perfect storm of applause, but was exceeded when Towne's name was brought in. All the delegates jumped on their chairs, waving flags, hats, fans, and shouting and cheering for Bryan and Towne. A resolution was adopted appointing a committee of fifteen, of which Hon. Henry M. Teller was chairman, to present to the Democratic National Convention the name of Charles A. Towne as a candidate for vice-president. The various state delegates announced their selections for members of the convention committees, and pending their organization and report, the convention adjourned until July 5, 1900, at 10 o'clock.

The convention was called to order by Temporary Chairman Teller at 10:30 a. m., July 5, 1900. He announced that the committee on resolutions were not yet ready to report. The report of the committee on cre-

dentials was read and accepted. The committee on permanent organization reported the selection of Judge L. W. Brown, of Ohio, as permanent chairman, and H. A. McCreary of California, as permanent secretary. Judge Brown was heartily applauded as he took the chair. He said that as the east turned to the west in the time of Lincoln, so it again turned to the west and found a leader in the person of William J. Bryan. The chairman's further allusion to Charles A. Towne as the candidate for second place caused more emphatic applause than that accorded to Bryan. "The money question will not be settled until the national banks are driven out of power. The questions of money and trusts were inseparable."

One remedy he suggested was the removal of duties on every article controlled by trusts. The demand for government ownership of the telegraphs and railroad systems of the country as made by the speaker met with approval by the convention. He arraigned the administration before the bar of the American public for its work in the Philippines.

Over 200 of the delegates present voted for Lincoln in 1861, and when the gray heads showed on the platform they were loudly cheered. As there was no prospect of the committee on resolutions bringing in a report, the convention adjourned until Friday, July 6, 1900, at 9 o'clock.

The convention met at 10 a. m., July 6, 1900, and after prayer by Dr. Bigelow, of Cincinnati, immediately took up the report of the committee on resolutions, the platform being as follows:

We recognize that the principles set forth in the Declaration of American Independence are fundamental and everlastingly true in their application to governments among men. We believe the patriotic words of Washington's farewell to be the words of sober-

ness and wisdom. We treasure the words of Jefferson as priceless gems of American statesmanship. We hold in sacred remembrance the broad philanthropy and patriotism of Lincoln, who was the great interpreter of American history and the great apostle of human rights and of industrial freedom.

We declare our adherence to the principle of bimetalism as the right basis of a monetary system under our national constitution.

We declare it to be our intention to lend our efforts to the repeal of the currency law, which not only repudiates the ancient and time-honored principles of the American people before the constitution was adopted, but is violative of the principles of the constitution itself, and we shall not cease our efforts until there has been established in its place a monetary system based upon the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold into money at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1 by the independent action of the United States.

We are in favor of a graduated tax upon incomes, and, if necessary, to accomplish this, we favor an amendment to the constitution.

We believe that United States senators ought to be elected by a direct vote of the people.

We favor the maintenance and extension wherever practicable of the merit system in the public service.

Combinations, trusts, and monopolies contrived and arranged for the purpose of controlling the prices and quantity of articles supplied to the public are unjust, unlawful, and oppressive. We declare against them.

We believe the Monroe doctrine to be sound in principle and a wise national policy, and we demand a firm adherence thereto.

We declare that an interoceanic canal, when constructed, ought to be controlled by the United States in the interests of American nations.

We are in favor of the principles of direct legislation.

We tender to the patriotic people of the South African republics our sympathy and express our admiration for them in their heroic attempts to preserve their political freedom and maintain their national independence. We believe in a republican form of government, and are opposed to monarchy and to the whole theory of imperialistic control. We are in favor of applying to the Philippine archipelago the principle we are solemnly and publicly pledged to observe in the case of Cuba.

There being no longer any necessity for collecting war taxes, we demand the repeal of the war taxes levied to carry on the war with Spain.

We observe with satisfaction the growing sentiment among the people in favor of the public ownership and operation of public utilities.

We are opposed to the importation of Asiatic laborers in competition with American labor and demand a more rigid enforcement of the laws relating thereto.

The report was accepted, and Chairman Teller aroused the enthusiasm of the delegates by launching into an

elegant tribute to W. J. Bryan, and in conclusion placed him in nomination for president as the candidate for the silver republican party. Long continued cheering followed the nomination. Delegates stood on their chairs, waved hats and flags and shouted acclaim of the Nebraska statesman until they could shout no more. Brief seconding speeches were made by Lieutenant-Governor Hutchinson, of Idaho; Captain H. B. Lason, of South Dakota; H. A. Turner, of Kansas; Judge Van Vorhis, of Indiana; Judge Spurrier, of Iowa; S. L. Carey, of Louisiana; Judge S. W. Hopkins, of Michigan, and W. T. Foster, of Missouri, the latter being cheered for stating he seconded the nomination of Bryan "in the behalf of twenty-five members of the Missouri delegation who voted for Fremont, seventy who voted for Lincoln, and a hundred who served in the civil war."

On the call of states every delegate voted for Bryan. After hearing a speech from Webster Davis, the convention passed a resolution making every delegate a member of a committee to attend the democratic convention and work for the nomination of Towne for vice-president. The convention then adjourned until 3:30 p. m.

When the convention assembled in the afternoon, it was in an ugly mood. The nomination of Stevenson as the vice-presidential candidate on the democratic ticket had upset their most cherished plans, and when Delegate Lewis, of Nebraska, moved to endorse Stevenson for the vice-presidency, a perfect storm of groans and protests arose from the delegates. "We want Towne!" "Nominate Charley Towne!" came from all parts of the hall. Finally, Mr. McNall nominated Charles A. Towne, and a dozen seconds were given from all sections of the hall.

Senator Teller, as chairman of the convention,

begged and pleaded with the delegates. He urged them not to do anything that would injure the chances of the success of Mr. Bryan. "Don't, gentlemen," he pleaded; "be moderate." With his voice betraying deep emotion, Senator Teller said, "I am going to support Mr. Bryan, and the ticket in every way I can, not for Mr. Bryan, but for the country which I so love," and then Mr. Teller, with tears streaming from his eyes, took his seat.

W. T. Foster gained the floor, and insisted upon the chair putting the question. During the confusion that resulted Mr. Towne entered the hall, and in an instant there was pandemonium. Mr. Towne finally took the platform and said: "I don't want you to nominate me for vice-president. I understand what my duty is in this matter. The silver republicans have made a good fight. They have been defeated, but it is your duty to support the ticket nominated by the national democratic convention."

He insisted there was an issue in the coming election which towers above men, and implored the convention to look at it as he did. Finally, after many hours of wrangling, a motion was made by Senator Dubois that the whole question of the vice-presidency be left to the national committee with power to report at a later date, and this was agreed to. The convention then adjourned.

On July 7, 1900, the Silver Republican National Committee issued the following address:

"To the Silver Republicans of the United States: The democratic national convention of 1900 has nominated William J. Bryan for president and Adlai E. Stevenson for vice-president. The silver republican national convention of 1900 has nominated William J. Bryan for president and referred the matter of a candidate for vice-president to its national committee, with power to act. Your committee has carefully considered the whole matter. It met in conference with representatives of the democratic and of the people's party national committees, and went over the ground fully.

"Your committee found itself face to face with these facts:

"In 1896 thousands of voters who had heretofore voted the republican ticket found themselves so widely at variance with their party's platform that they could not, without self-stultification, longer act with the republican party. In that year they found in the democratic candidate for president and in the platform upon which he stood a complete and sufficient justification for giving him their hearty support. With him they went down to defeat, but in that defeat won a victory for manhood and patriotic independence for which they have no apology to offer, and in which they feel a just pride. They retain and preserve their right to vote as their conscience and their judgment dictate. They bow to no party boss, and have not abdicated their right to think.

"In 1896 the republican party made a profound departure from the traditions and interests of the American people, and of that party, by rejecting the free coinage of silver along with gold and placing itself in a position to adopt the gold standard. This year it has declared itself unreservedly for the gold standard. This continues the controversy of 1896. But, in addition to its departure from the advocacy of bimetallism, it has now still more profoundly departed from the traditions and interests of the American people by becoming the apologist for and the champion of trusts and monopolies, and has introduced such imperialistic practices and theories into the administration of the affairs of government that, for the first time in the history of that party, its national convention could not even refer to the declaration of independence, and this, although its convention of 1900 met in such a place and within such environment that the great declaration would have peculiarly appealed to the party had it still listened to the voice that, in that earlier and better day, pleaded for a government 'of the people, for the people, and by the people.' In the face of such profound departures from the traditions and interests of the American people, we cannot return to the republican party.

"On the other hand, we find the democratic party has again placed itself right on the money question, right on the question of trusts and monopolies, right as the champion of the declaration of independence, and of constitutional government, right in expressing its sympathy for other nations who only ask 'that which you would that others should do unto you, do ye even so unto them.'

"The democratic candidate for president is ours; our convention named him. Upon the fundamental propositions above stated we are one with the democratic and the people's party. Our common candidate for president is enlisted heart and soul in this great cause. We know he has the high courage of his convictions. His triumph is necessary if we are to hand down to our children and our children's children a government founded in the wisdom of the fathers, maintained by the blood and treasure of its citizens, and perpetuated as a priceless heritage.

"Impelled by these considerations, your national committee has determined that its duty in this hour is to indorse the Hon. Adlai E. Stevenson as our candidate for vice-president in order that the opposition to the gold standard, trusts and monopolies, imperialism and

all its attendant evils may concentrate its votes at the danger point and accomplish the triumph of those principles so dear to us.

"It is but simple justice to say that in taking this action we are following the advice of our distinguished leader, the Hon. Charles A. Towne.

"Let us express the hope that our friends will lay aside whatever of disappointment they may feel and join in a united effort to secure the triumph of our principles at the coming election.

"D. C. TILLOTSON, Kansas,

"Chairman National Convention.

"E. S. CORSER, Minnesota,

"Secretary and Treasurer.

"FRED. T. DUBOIS, Idaho,

"Chairman Executive Committee.

"JOHN F. SHAFROTH, Colorado.

"S. W. BROWN, Ohio.

"D. FRANK POWELL, Wisconsin.

"NATHAN COLE, JR.

"All of Executive Committee."

CHAPTER IX.

UNCONDITIONAL REPEAL.

On February 9, 1893, the House having under consideration the following resolution:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House proceed to consider H. R. 10143, "A bill to increase the circulation of national banks and for other purposes," and if such bill shall not be disposed of on said day, then the consideration thereof shall be continued during the next legislative day.

Mr. Bryan made his first speech against unconditional repeal. It is given below:

FIRST SPEECH AGAINST UNCONDITIONAL REPEAL.

Mr. Speaker: We oppose the consideration of this bill because we oppose the bill, and we oppose the cloture which is asked in order to secure its passage, because the Democratic party dare not go before the people and tell them they refused cloture for free coinage—which is consistent with the history of the party; for the tariff bills which we promised to pass, and for the bill for the election of United States Senators by the people, and only yielded to it at the dictation of the moneyed institutions of this country and those who want to appreciate the value of a dollar.

I call attention to the fact that there is not in this bill a single line or sentence which is not opposed to the whole history of the Democratic party. We have opposed the principle of the national bank on all occasions, and yet you give them by this bill an increased currency of \$15,000,000. You have pledged the party to reduce the taxation upon the people, and yet, before you attempt to lighten this burden, you seek to take off one-half million of dollars annually from the national banks of the country; and even after declaring in your national platform that the Sherman act was a "cowardly makeshift," you attempt to take away the "makeshift" before you give us the real thing for which the makeshift was substituted.

What is a makeshift? It is a temporary expedient. And yet you tell us you will take away our temporary expedient

before you give us the permanent good. You tell a man who is fighting with a club that it is a miserable makeshift and that he ought to have a repeating rifle; and yet you tell him to throw away his club and wait until his enemy gives him the rifle. We do not like the present law. It did not come from us. The Sherman law is the child of the opponents of free coinage. But they have given it to us, and we will hold it as a hostage until they return to us our own child, "the gold and silver coinage of the Constitution." They kidnaped it twenty years ago, and we shall hold their child, ugly and deformed as it is, until they bring ours back or give us something better than the makeshift which we now have.

Mr. Speaker, consider the effect of this bill. It means that by suspending the purchase of silver we will throw 54,000,000 ounces on the market annually and reduce the price of silver bullion. It means that we will widen the difference between the coinage and bullion value of silver, and raise a greater obstacle in the way of bimetallism. It means to increase by billions of dollars the debts of our people. It means a reduction in the price of our wheat and our cotton. You have garbled the platform of the Democratic party. You have taken up one clause of it and refuse to give us a fulfillment of the other and more important clause, which demands that gold and silver shall be coined on equal terms without charge for mintage.

Mr. Speaker, this cannot be done. A man who murders another shortens by a few brief years the life of a human being; but he who votes to increase the burden of debts upon the people of the United States assumes a graver responsibility. If we who represent them consent to rob our people, the cotton-growers of the South and the wheat-growers of the West, we will be criminals whose guilt cannot be measured by words, for we will bring distress and disaster to our people. In many cases such a vote would simply be a summons to the sheriff to take possession of their property.

PRINCIPAL SPEECH AGAINST UNCONDITIONAL REPEAL.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 1) to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman act.

Mr. Speaker: I shall accomplish my full purpose if I am able to impress upon the members of the House the far-reaching consequences which may follow our action and quicken their appreciation of the grave responsibility which presses upon us. Historians tell us that the victory of Charles Martel at Tours determined the history of all Europe for centuries. It was a contest "between the Crescent and the Cross," and when, on that fateful day, the Frankish prince drove back the followers of Abderrahman he rescued the West from "the all-destroying grasp of Islam," and saved to Europe its Christian civilization. A greater than Tours is here! In my humble judg-

ment the vote of this House on the subject under consideration may bring to the people of the West and South, to the people of the United States, and to all mankind, weal or woe beyond the power of language to describe or imagination to conceive.

In the princely palace and in the humblest hamlet; by the financier and by the poorest toiler; here, in Europe and everywhere, the proceedings of this Congress, upon this problem will be read and studied; and as our actions bless or blight we shall be commended or condemned. The President of the United States, in the discharge of his duty as he sees it, has sent to Congress a message calling attention to the present financial situation, and recommending the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law as the only means of securing immediate relief. Some outside of this hall have insisted that the President's recommendation imposes upon Democratic members an obligation, as it were, to carry out his wishes, and over-zealous friends have even suggested that opposition to his views might subject the hardy dissenter to administrative displeasure. They do the President great injustice who presume that he would forget for a moment the independence of the two branches of Congress. He would not be worthy of our admiration or even respect if he demanded a homage which would violate the primary principles of free representative government.

Let his own language rebuke those who would disregard their pledges to their own people in order to display a false fealty. In the message which he sent to Congress in December, 1885, he said, in words which may well be our guide in this great crisis: "The zealous watchfulness of our constituencies, great and small, supplements their suffrages, and before the tribunal they establish every public servant should be judged." Among the many grand truths expressed felicitously by the President during his public career none show a truer conception of official duty or describe with more clearness the body from which the member receives his authority and to which he owes his responsibility.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is before the tribunal established by our constituencies, and before that tribunal only that we must appear for judgment upon our actions here. When we each accepted a commission from 180,000 people we pledged ourselves to protect their rights from invasion and to reflect their wishes to the best of our ability, and we must stand defenseless before the bar if our only excuse is "he recommended it." And remember, sir, that these constituencies include not bankers, brokers, and boards of trade only, but embrace people in every station and condition of life; and in that great court from whose decision there is no appeal every voter has an equal voice. That the Democratic party understands the duty of the Representative, is evident from the fact that it found it necessary to nonconcur in a similar recommendation made by the President in 1885.

In the message which he sent to the Forty-ninth Congress, at the beginning of the first session, we find these words:

Prosperity hesitates upon our threshold because of the dangers and uncertainties surrounding this question. Capital timidly shrinks from trade, and investors are unwilling to take the chance of the questionable shape in which their money will be returned to them, while enterprise halts at a risk against which care and sagacious management do not protect.

As a necessary consequence labor lacks employment, and suffering and distress are visited upon a portion of our fellow-citizens especially entitled to the careful consideration of those charged with the duties of legislation. No interest appeals to us so strongly for a safe and stable currency as the vast army of the unemployed. I recommend the suspension of the compulsory coinage of silver dollars, directed by the law passed in February, 1878.

It will be seen that the same forces were at work then as now; the same apprehensions existed as now; the same pressure was brought from the same sources in favor of the debasement of silver; but the members of Congress, refusing to take counsel of their fears, stood by the record of both great parties and by the Nation's history and retained the coinage of silver as then provided for. Let it be said to the credit of the Democratic party that in the House only thirty-three of its members voted to suspend the Bland law, while 130 are recorded against suspension. Time has proved that the members, reflecting the opinions of their people, were wiser than the Executive, and he is doubtless grateful to-day that they did not follow his suggestion.

I have read with care the message sent to us last week, and have considered it in the light of every reasonable construction of which it is capable. If I am able to understand its language it points to the burial of silver, with no promise of resurrection. Its reasoning is in the direction of a single standard. It leads irresistibly to universal gold monometallism—to a realm over whose door is written: "Abandon hope, all ye who enter here!" Before that door I stop, appalled. Have gentlemen considered the effect of a single gold standard universally adopted? Let us not deceive ourselves with the hope that we can discard silver for gold, and that other nations will take it up and keep it as a part of the world's currency. When all the silver available for coinage could gain admission to some mints and all the gold available for coinage would find a place for mintage, and some nation like France maintained the parity by means of bimetallicism it was of comparatively little importance whether a particular nation used silver, or gold, or both.

Exchange did not fluctuate and trade could be carried on without inconvenience. But times have changed. One nation after another has closed its mints to silver until the white metal has, in European countries, been made an outcast by legislation and has shown a bullion value different from its coinage value. India, at last, guided by the misrepresentations of the metropolitan press, which proclaimed as certain what was never probable, has suspended free coinage, fearing

that this country would stop the purchase of silver. If the United States, the greatest silver producing nation, which now utilizes more than one-third of the total annual product of the world, closes its mint to the coinage of silver, what assurance have we that it can retain its place as primary money in the commercial world?

Is it not more reasonable to suppose that a further fall in the bullion value of silver will be followed by a demand for a limitation of the legal tender qualities of the silver already in existence? That is already being urged by some. Is it not reasonable to suppose that our hostile action will lead to hostile action on the part of other nations? Every country must have money for its people, and if silver is abandoned and gold substituted it must be drawn from the world's already scanty supply. We hear much about a "stable currency" and an "honest dollar." It is a significant fact that those who have spoken in favor of unconditional repeal have for the most part avoided a discussion of the effect of an appreciating standard. They take it for granted that a gold standard is not only an honest standard, but the only stable standard. I denounce that child of ignorance and avarice, the gold dollar under a universal gold standard, as the most dishonest dollar which we could employ.

I stand upon the authority of every intelligent writer upon political economy when I assert that there is not and never has been an honest dollar. An honest dollar is a dollar absolutely stable in relation to all other things. Laughlin, in his work on Bimetallism, says:

Monometallists do not—as is often said—believe that gold remains absolutely stable in value. They hold that there is no such thing as a "standard of value" for future payments in either gold or silver which remains absolutely invariable.

He even suggests a multiple standard for long-time contracts. I quote his words:

As regards National debts, it is distinctly averred that neither gold nor silver forms a just measure of deferred payments, and that if justice in long contracts is sought for, we should not seek it by the doubtful and untried expedient of international bimetallism, but by the clear and certain method of a multiple standard, a unit based upon the selling prices of a number of articles of general consumption. A long-time contract would thereby be paid at its maturity by the same purchasing power as was given in the beginning.

Jevons, one of the most generally accepted of the writers in favor of a gold standard, admits the instability of a single standard, and in language very similar to that above quoted suggests the multiple standard as the most equitable if practicable. Chevalier, who wrote a book in 1858 to show the injustice of allowing a debtor to pay his debts in a cheap gold dollar, recognized the same fact, and said:

If the value of the metal declined, the creditor would suffer a loss upon the quantity he had received; if, on the contrary, it rose, the debtor would have to pay more than he calculated upon.

I am on sound and scientific ground, therefore, when I say that a dollar approaches honesty as its purchasing power approaches stability. If I borrow a thousand dollars to-day and next year pay the debt with a thousand dollars which will secure exactly as much of all things desirable as the one thousand which I borrowed, I have paid in honest dollars. If the money has increased or decreased in purchasing power, I have satisfied my debt with dishonest dollars. While the government can say that a given weight of gold or silver shall constitute a dollar, and invest that dollar with legal-tender qualities, it cannot fix the purchasing power of the dollar. That must depend upon the law of supply and demand, and it may be well to suggest that this government never tried to fix the exchangeable value of a dollar until it began to limit the number of dollars coined.

If the number of dollars increases more rapidly than the need for dollars—as it did after the gold discoveries of 1849—the exchangeable value of each dollar will fall and prices rise. If the demand for dollars increases faster than the number of dollars—as it did after 1800—the price of each dollar will rise and prices generally will fall. The relative value of the dollar may be changed by natural causes or by legislation. An increased supply—the demand remaining the same—or a decreased demand—the supply remaining the same—will reduce the exchangeable value of each dollar. Natural causes may act on both supply and demand; as, for instance, by increasing the product from the mines or by increasing the amount consumed in the arts. Legislation acts directly on the demand, and thus affects the price, since the demand is one of the factors in fixing the price.

If by legislative action the demand for silver is destroyed and the demand for gold is increased by making it the only standard, the exchangeable value of each unit of that standard, or dollar, as we call it, will be increased. If the exchangeable value of the dollar is increased by legislation the debt of the debtor is increased, to his injury and to the advantage of the creditor. And let me suggest here, in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McCall), who said that the money loaner was entitled to the advantages derived from improved machinery and inventive genius, that he is mistaken. The laboring man and the producer are entitled to these benefits, and the money loaner, by every law of justice, ought to be content with a dollar equal in purchasing power to the dollar which he loaned, and any one desiring more than that desires a dishonest dollar, it matters not what name he may give to it. Take an illustration: John Doe, of Nebraska, has a farm worth \$2,000 and mortgages it to Richard Roe, of Massachusetts, for \$1,000. Suppose the value of the monetary unit is increased by legislation which creates a greater demand for gold. The debt is increased. If the increase amounts to 100 per cent. the Nebraska farmer finds that the prices of his products have fallen

one-half and his land loses one-half its value, unless the price is maintained by the increased population incident to a new country.

The mortgage remains nominally the same, though the debt has actually become twice as great. Will he be deceived by the cry of "honest dollar?" If he should loan a Nebraska neighbor a hog weighing 100 pounds and the next spring demand in return a hog weighing 200 pounds he would be called dishonest, even though he contended that he was only demanding one hog—just the number he loaned. Society has become accustomed to some very nice distinctions. The poor man is called a socialist if he believes that the wealth of the rich should be divided among the poor, but the rich man is called a financier if he devises a plan by which the pittance of the poor can be converted to his use.

The poor man who takes property by force is called a thief, but the creditor who can by legislation make a debtor pay a dollar twice as large as he borrowed is lauded as the friend of a sound currency. The man who wants the people to destroy the Government is an anarchist, but the man who wants the Government to destroy the people is a patriot.

The great desire now seems to be to restore confidence, and some have an idea that the only way to restore confidence is to coax the money loaner to let go of his hoard by making the profits too tempting to be resisted. Capital is represented as a shy and timid maiden who must be courted, if won. Let me suggest a plan for bringing money from Europe. If it be possible, let us enact a law "Whereas confidence must be restored; and whereas money will always come from its hiding place if the inducement is sufficient, Therefore, be it enacted, That every man who borrows \$1 shall pay back \$2 and interest (the usury law not to be enforced)."

Would not English capital come "on the swiftest ocean greyhounds?" The money loaner of London would say: "I will not loan in India or Egypt or in South America. The inhabitants of those countries are a wicked and ungodly people and refuse to pay more than they borrowed. I will loan in the United States, for there lives an honest people, who delight in a sound currency and pay in an honest dollar." Why does not some one propose that plan? Because no one would dare to increase by law the number of dollars which the debtor must pay, and yet by some it is called wise statesmanship to do indirectly and in the dark what no man has the temerity to propose directly and openly.

We have been called cranks and lunatics and idiots because we have warned our fellow-men against the inevitable and intolerable consequences which would follow the adoption of a gold standard by all the world. But who, I ask, can be silent in the presence of such impending calamities? The United States, England, France, and Germany own to-day about \$2,600,000,000 of the world's supply of gold coin, or about five-sevenths of the total amount, and yet these four nations contain

but a small fraction of the inhabitants of the globe. What will be the exchangeable value of a gold dollar when India's people, outnumbering alone the inhabitants of the four great nations named, reach out after their share of gold coin? What will be the final price of gold when all the nations of the Occident and Orient join in the scramble?

A distinguished advocate of the gold standard said recently, in substance: "Wheat has now reached a point where the English can afford to buy it, and gold will soon return to relieve our financial embarrassment." How delighted the farmer will be when he realizes what an opportunity he has to save his country! A nation in distress; banks failing; mines closed; laborers unemployed; enterprise at a standstill, and behold, the farmer, bowed with unceasing, even if unremunerative, toil, steps forth to save his country—by selling his wheat below the cost of production! And I am afraid he will even now be censured for allowing the panic to go as far as it has before reducing his prices.

It seems cruel that upon the growers of wheat and cotton, our staple exports, should be placed the burden of supplying us, at whatever cost, with the necessary gold, and yet the financier quoted has suggested the only means, except the issue of bonds, by which our stock of gold can be replenished. If it is difficult now to secure gold, what will be the condition when the demand is increased by its adoption as the world's only primary money? We would simply put gold upon an auction block, with every nation as a bidder, and each ounce of the standard metal would be knocked down to the one offering the most of all other kinds of property. Every disturbance of finance in one country would communicate itself to every other, and in the misery which would follow it would be of little consolation to know that others were suffering as much as, or more than, we.

I have only spoken of the immediate effects of the substitution of gold as the world's only money of ultimate redemption. The worst remains to be told. If, as in the resumption of specie payments in 1879, we could look forward to a time when the contraction would cease, the debtor might become a tenant upon his former estate and the home owner assume the role of the homeless with the sweet assurance that his children or his children's children might live to enjoy the blessings of a "stable currency." But, sir, the hapless and hopeless producer of wealth goes forth into a night illuminated by no star; he embarks upon a sea whose further shore no mariner may find; he travels in a desert where the ever-retreating mirage makes his disappointment a thousand-fold more keen. Let the world once commit its fortunes to the use of gold alone and it must depend upon the annual increase of that metal to keep pace with the need for money.

The Director of the Mint gives about \$130,000,000 as the world's production last year. Something like one-third is produced in connection with silver, and must be lost if silver min-



James K. Jones



John S. Altyeld

ing is rendered unproductive. It is estimated that nearly two-thirds of the annual product is used in the arts, and the amount so used is increasing. Where, then, is the supply to meet the increasing demands of an increasing population? Is there some new California or some undiscovered Australia yet to be explored?

Is it not probable that the supply available for coinage will diminish rather than increase? Jacobs, in his work on the Precious Metals, has calculated the appreciation of the monetary unit. He has shown that the almost imperceptible increase of 2 per cent. per year will amount to a total appreciation of 500 per cent. in a century. Or, to illustrate, that cotton at 10 cents to-day and wheat at 60 cents would mean cotton at 2 cents and wheat at 12 cents in one hundred years. A national, State, or municipal debt renewed from time to time would, at the end of that period, be six times as great as when contracted, although several times the amount would have been paid in interest.

When one realizes the full significance of a constantly appreciating standard he can easily agree with Alison that the Dark Ages resulted from a failure of the money supply. How can anyone view with unconcern the attempt to turn back the tide of civilization by the complete debasement of one-half of the world's money! When I point to the distress which, not suddenly, but gradually, is entering the habitations of our people; when I refer you to the census as conclusive evidence of the unequal distribution of wealth and of increasing tenancy among our people, of whom, in our cities, less than one-fourth now own their homes; when I suggest the possibility of this condition continuing until passed from a land of independent owners, we become a nation of landlords and tenants, you must tremble for civil liberty itself.

Free government cannot long survive when the thousands enjoy the wealth of the country and the million share its poverty in common. Even now you hear among the rich an occasionally expressed contempt for popular government, and among the poor a protest against legislation which makes them "toil that others may reap." I appeal to you to restore justice and bring back prosperity while yet a peaceable solution can be secured. We mourn the lot of unhappy Ireland, whose alien owners drain it of its home created wealth; but we may reach a condition, if present tendencies continue, when her position at this time will be an object of envy, and some poet may write of our cities as Goldsmith did of the "Deserted Village:"

While scourged by famine from a smiling land,
The mournful peasant leads his humble band,
And, while he sinks without one hand to save,
The country blooms—a garden and a grave.

But, lest I may be accused of reasonless complaining, let me call unimpeachable witnesses who will testify to the truth of my premises and to the correctness of my conclusions.

Jevons says:

If all nations of the globe were suddenly and simultaneously to demonetize silver and require gold money a revolution in the value of gold would be inevitable.

Giffin, who is probably the most fanatical adherent of the gold standard, says, in his book entitled *The Case Against Bimetallism*:

The primary offender in the matter, perhaps, was Germany, which made a mistake, as I believe, in substituting gold for silver as the standard money of the country. * * * To some extent also Italy has been an offender in this matter, the resumption of specie payments in that country on a gold basis being entirely a work of superfluity; the resumption on a silver basis would have been preferable. * * * No doubt the pressure on gold would have been more severe than it has been if the United States had not passed the Bland coinage law.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Rayner) said in the opening speech of this debate:

In my opinion there is not a sufficient amount of gold in existence to supply the demands of commerce and the necessities of the world's circulation.

Mr. Balfour, member of Parliament, in a speech recently made, said:

Let Germany, India, and the United States try a gold currency and a tremor seizes every one of our commercial magnates. They look forward, in the immediate future, to catastrophe, and feel that the ultimate result may be a slow appreciation of the standard of value, which is perhaps the most deadening and benumbing influence that can touch the enterprise of a nation.

Mr. Goschen, delegate from Great Britain, said at the International Monetary Conference in 1878:

If, however, other States were to carry on a propaganda in favor of a gold standard and the demonetization of silver, the Indian government would be obliged to reconsider its position and might be forced by events to take measures similar to those taken elsewhere. In that case the scramble to get rid of silver might provoke one of the gravest crises ever undergone by commerce. One or two States might demonetize silver without serious results, but if all demonetize there would be no buyers, and silver would fall in alarming proportions. * * * If all States should resolve on the adoption of a gold standard, the question arose, would there be sufficient gold for the purpose without a tremendous crisis? There would be a fear on the one hand of a depreciation of silver, and one on the other of a rise in the value of gold, and a corresponding fall in the prices of all commodities.

Italy, Russia, and Austria, whenever they resume specie payments, would require metal, and if all other States went in the direction of a gold standard, these countries too would be forced to take gold. Resumption on their part would be facilitated by the maintenance of silver as a part of the legal tender of the world. The American proposal for a universal double standard seemed impossible of realization, a veritable Utopia; but the theory of a universal gold standard was Utopian, and indeed involved a false Utopia. It was better for the world at large that the two metals should continue in circulation than that one should be universally substituted for the other.

Thus does an eminent English monometallist denounce the idea of a universal gold standard and foretell its consequences. But we are not dependent for authority upon foreign advocates

of a gold standard. Read the words of him who for many years was the guiding genius of the Republican party, Hon. James G. Blaine, and say whether he was a lunatic because he described in emphatic words the dangers attendant upon universal monometallism. He said upon the floor of the House, February 7, 1878:

On the much vexed and long mooted question as to a bimetallic or monometallic standard, my own views are sufficiently indicated in the remarks I have made. I believe the struggle now going on in this country and in other countries for a single gold standard would, if successful, produce widespread disaster in and throughout the commercial world.

The destruction of silver as money and establishing gold as the sole unit of value must have a ruinous effect on all forms of property except those investments which yield a fixed return in money. These would be enormously enhanced in value, and would gain a disproportionate and unfair advantage over every other species of property. If, as the most reliable statistics affirm, there are nearly \$7,000,000,000 of coin or bullion in the world, not very unequally divided between gold and silver, it is impossible to strike silver out of existence as money without results which will prove distressing to millions and utterly disastrous to tens of thousands.

Again, he said:

I believe gold and silver coin to be the money of the Constitution; indeed, the money of the American people anterior to the Constitution which the great organic law recognized as quite independent of its own existence. No power was conferred on Congress to declare either metal should not be money. Congress has, therefore, in my judgment, no power to demonetize silver any more than to demonetize gold.

Senator Sherman said in 1869:

The contraction of the currency is a far more distressing operation than Senators suppose. Our own and other nations have gone through that operation before. It is not possible to take that voyage without the sorest distress. To every person except a capitalist out of debt, or a salaried officer or annuitant, it is a period of loss, danger, lassitude of trade, fall of wages, suspension of enterprise, bankruptcy, and disaster. It means ruin of all dealers whose debts are twice their business capital, though one-third less than their actual property. It means the fall of all agricultural production without any great reduction of taxes. What prudent man would dare to build a house, a railroad, a factory, or a barn with this certain fact before him?

Let me quote from an apostle of the Democratic faith, whose distinguished services in behalf of his party and his country have won for him the esteem of all. Mr. Carlisle, then a member of the House of Representatives, said, February 21, 1878:

I know that the world's stock of precious metals is none too large, and I see no reason to apprehend that it will ever be so. Mankind will be fortunate indeed if the annual production of gold and silver coin shall keep pace with the annual increase of population and industry. According to my views of the subject the conspiracy which seems to have been formed here and in Europe to destroy by legislation and otherwise from three-sevenths to one-half the metallic money of the world is the most gigantic crime of this or any other age. The consummation of such a scheme would ultimately entail more misery upon the human race than all the wars, pestilences, and famines that ever occurred in the history of the world.

The absolute and instantaneous destruction of half the entire movable property of the world, including houses, ships, railroads, and other

appliances for carrying on commerce, while it would be felt more sensibly at the moment, would not produce anything like the prolonged distress and disorganization of society that must inevitably result from the permanent annihilation of one-half the metallic money of the world.

The junior Senator from Texas (Mr. Mills) never did the party greater service than when, on the 3rd of February, 1886, on this floor he denounced, in language, the force and earnestness of which can not be surpassed, the attempted crime against silver. Let his words be an inspiration now:

But in all the wild, reckless, and remorseless brutalities that have marked the foot-prints of resistless power there is some extenuating circumstance that mitigates the severity of the punishment due the crime. Some have been the product of the fierce passions of war, some have come from the antipathy that separates alien races, some from the superstitions of opposing religions.

But the crime that is now sought to be perpetrated on more than fifty millions of people comes neither from the camp of a conqueror, the hand of a foreigner, nor the altar of an idolator. But it comes from those in whose veins runs the blood of the common ancestry, who were born under the same skies, speak the same language, reared in the same institutions, and nurtured in the principles of the same religious faith. It comes from the cold, phlegmatic, marble heart of avarice—avarice that seeks to paralyze labor, increase the burden of debt, and all the land with destitution and suffering to gratify the lust for gold—avarice surrounded by every comfort that wealth can command, and rich enough to satisfy every want save that which refuses to be satisfied without the suffocation and strangulation of all the labor of the land. With a forehead that refuses to be ashamed it demands of Congress an act that will paralyze all the forces of production, shut out labor from all employment, increase the burden of debts and taxation, and send desolation and suffering to all the homes of the poor.

Can language be stronger or conclusion more conclusive? What expression can be more forcible than the "most gigantic crime of this or any other age?" What picture more vivid than that painted in the words, "The consummation of such a scheme would ultimately entail more misery upon the human race than all the wars, pestilences, and famines that ever occurred in the history of the world?" What more scathing rebuke could be administered to avarice than that contained in the words of Mr. Mills?

It is from the awful horrors described by these distinguished men, differing in politics, but united in sentiment, that I beg you, sirs, to save your fellow-men.

On the base of the monument erected by a grateful people to the memory of the late Senator Hill, of Georgia, are inscribed these words:

Who saves his country saves himself, and all things saved do bless him. Who lets his country die lets all things die, dies himself ignobly, and all things dying, curse him.

If, sirs, in saving your country you save yourselves and earn the benedictions of all things saved, how much greater will be your reward if your efforts save not your country only but all mankind! If he who lets his country die, brings upon himself the curses of all things dying; in what language will an indignant people express their execration, if your action

lead to the enslavement of the great majority of the people by the universal adoption of an appreciating standard.

Let me call your attention briefly to the advantages of bimetallism. It is not claimed that by the use of two metals at a fixed ratio absolute stability can be secured. We only contend that thus the monetary unit will become more stable in relation to other property than under a single standard. If a single standard were really more desirable than a double standard, we are not free to choose gold, and would be compelled to select silver. Gold and silver must remain component parts of the metallic money of the world—that must be accepted as an indisputable fact. Our abandonment of silver would in all probability drive it out of use as primary money; and silver as a promise to pay gold is little, if any, better than a paper promise to pay. If bimetallism is impossible, then we must make up our minds to a silver standard or to the abandonment of both gold and silver.

Let us suppose the worst that has been prophesied by our opponents, namely, that we would be upon a silver standard if we attempted the free coinage of both gold and silver at any ratio. Let us suppose that all our gold goes to Europe and we have only silver. Silver would not be inconvenient to use, because a silver certificate is just as convenient to handle as a gold certificate, and the silver itself need not be handled except where it is necessary for change. Gold is not handled among the people. No one desires to accept any large amount in gold. The fact that the Treasury has always on hand a large amount of gold coin deposited in exchange for gold certificates shows that the paper representative is more desirable than the metal itself. If, following out the supposition, our gold goes abroad, Europe will have more money with which to buy our exports—cotton and wheat, cattle and hogs.

If, on the other hand, we adopt gold, we must draw it from Europe, and thus lessen their money and reduce the price of our exports in foreign markets. This, too, would decrease the total value of our exports and increase the amount of products which it would be necessary to send abroad to pay the principal and interest which we owe to bondholders and stockholders residing in Europe. Some have suggested the advisability of issuing gold bonds in order to maintain a gold standard. Let them remember that those bonds sold in this country will draw money from circulation and increase the stringency, and sold abroad will affect injuriously the price of our products abroad, thus making a double tax upon the toilers of the United States, who must ultimately pay them.

Let them remember, too, that gold bonds held abroad must some time be paid in gold, and the exportation of that gold would probably raise a clamor for an extension of time in order to save this country from another stringency. A silver standard, too, would make us the trading center of all the silver-using countries of the world, and these countries con-

tain far more than one-half of the world's population. What an impetus would be given to our Western and Southern seaports, such as San Francisco, Galveston, New Orleans, Mobile, Savannah, and Charleston! Then, again, we produce our silver, and produce it in quantities which would to some extent satisfy our monetary needs.

On motion of Mr. Hunter the time of Mr. Bryan was extended indefinitely.

Mr. Bryan. I thank the gentleman from Illinois and the House.

Our annual product of gold is less than 50 cents per capita. Deduct from this sum the loss which would be occasioned to the gold supply by the closing of our silver mines, which produce gold in conjunction with silver; deduct, also, the amount consumed in the arts, and the amount left for coinage is really inconsiderable. Thus, with a gold standard, we would be left dependent upon foreign powers for our annual money supply. They say we must adopt a gold standard in order to trade with Europe. Why not reverse the proposition and say that Europe must resume the use of silver in order to trade with us? But why adopt either gold or silver alone? Why not adopt both and trade with both gold-using and silver-using countries? The principle of bimetallism is established upon a scientific basis.

The Government does not try to fix the purchasing power of the dollar, either gold or silver. It simply says, in the language of Thomas Jefferson, "The money unit shall stand upon the two metals," and then allows the exchangeable value of that unit to rise or fall according as the total product of both metals decreases or increases in proportion to the demand for money. In attempting to maintain the parity between the two metals at a fixed ratio, the Government does not undertake the impossible. France for several years did maintain the parity approximately at 15½ to 1 by offering unlimited coinage to both metals at that ratio. It is very common for some people to urge, "You cannot put value into anything by law," and I am sorry to see some proclaim this who know by rich experience how easy it is for the Government to legislate prices up or down.

We were called together to relieve financial distress by legislation. Some propose to relieve the present stringency of the money market by removing the tax on national bank circulation and allowing banks to issue 100 per cent. on their bonds instead of 90 per cent. This legislation would put value into bank stocks by law, because it would add to the profits of the bank, and such a law would probably raise the market price of bonds by increasing the demand for them. I will not discuss the merits of this proposition now. Let those who favor it prepare to justify themselves before their constituents. The New York World of August 3 contained an article encouraging the banks to issue more money under the present law. It showed the profits as follows:

These bonds are selling now at 109 to 110. At this latter period a \$100,000 bond transaction would stand as follows:

\$100,000 U. S. 4's at 110, less 1-3 per cent. accrued interest,	\$109,666
net; would cost.....	\$109,666
Less circulation issued on this amount.....	90,000

Making the actual cash investment only.....	\$19,666
On which the bank would receive an income of over 12 7-8 per cent., as follows:	
Interest on \$100,000 4's per annum.....	\$4,000
Less tax 1 per cent. on circulation.....	\$900
Less sinking fund to retire premium to be improved at 6 per cent.....	464
Less expenses.....	100
	1,464

Net income..... \$2,536

Already a good portion of these bonds held in reserve are coming into the market and will soon find their way into the hands of national banks.

If the proposed law is adopted \$900 will be taken from the expense column by the repeal of the tax on circulation and \$10,000 will be taken from the cost of investment, so that the profits would amount to \$3,436 on an investment of \$9,666, or more than 33 per cent. If, however, the increased demand for bonds raised the premium to 15 per cent., we could only calculate a little less than \$3,436 on an investment of \$14,666, or nearly 25 per cent. This they would probably call a fair divide. The bondholder would receive an advantage in the increased premium of, say, \$25,000,000, and the national bank would be able to make about double on its investment what it does now. If the premium should increase more than 5 per cent. the bondholder would make more and the bank less. If the premium should not increase that much the bondholder would make less and the bank more.

Let those, I repeat, who favor this plan, be prepared to defend it before a constituency composed of people who are not making 5 per cent. on an average on the money invested in farms or enterprises, and let those who will profit by the law cease to deny the ability of Government to increase the price of property by law. One is almost moved to tears by the sight of New England manufacturers protesting with indignation against the wisdom or possibility of giving fictitious value to a product, when for the last thirty years they have drained the rest of the country and secured artificial prices by protective tariff laws. Some of our eastern friends accuse the advocates of free coinage of favoring repudiation.

Repudiation has not been practiced much in recent years by the debtor, but in 1869 the Credit Strengthening Act enabled the bondholder to repudiate a contract made with the Government and to demand coin in payment of a bond for which he had given paper and which was payable in lawful money. That act increasing the market value of the bonds gave a profit to many who now join the beneficiaries of the act assuming the District debt in vociferous proclamation that "the Government cannot create value." Does not the loca-

tion of a public building add to the value of adjacent real estate? Do not towns contest the location of a county seat because of the advantage it brings? Does not the use of gold and silver as money increase the value of each metal?

These are called precious metals because the production is limited and cannot be increased indefinitely at will. If this Government or a number of governments can offer a market unlimited as compared with the supply, the bullion value of gold and silver can be maintained at the legal ratio. The moment one metal tends to cheapen, the use falls on it and increases its price, while the decreased demand for the dearer metal retards its rise and thus the bullion values are kept near to their legal ratio, so near that the variation can cause far less inconvenience and injustice than the variation in the exchangeable value of the unit would inflict under a single standard. The option is always given to the debtor in a double standard.

In fact, the system could not exist if the option remained with the creditor, for he would demand the dearer metal and thus increase any fluctuation in bullion values, while the option in the hands of the debtor reduces the fluctuation to the minimum. That the unit under a double standard is more stable in its relation to all other things is admitted by Jevons and proven by several illustrations. Mr. Giffen tries to avoid the force of the admission by saying that the difference in favor of the double standard is only in the proportion of 2 to 1, and therefore not sufficient to justify its adoption. It would seem that where stability is so important—and it never was so important as to-day, when so many long-time contracts are executed—even a slight difference in favor of the double standard ought to make it acceptable.

We established a bimetallic standard in 1792, but silver, being overvalued by our ratio of 15 to 1, stayed with us and gold went abroad, where mint ratios were more favorable.

I have here a silver coin [exhibiting it] which came from the mint in 1795. It has upon the edge these significant words "Hundred Cents—One Dollar or Unit." It would seem, therefore, that the weight of the gold dollar was regulated by the silver dollar, and the gold pieces provided for made multiples of it. In 1834 and in 1837 the alloy was changed and the gold dollar reduced in size in order to correspond to the newly established ratio of 16 to 1. The amount of pure silver in the standard dollar has never been changed since its adoption in 1792.

The ratio of 16 to 1 overvalued gold and our silver went abroad. The silver dollar was worth about 3 cents more than the gold dollar, because it could be coined in France at the ratio of $15\frac{1}{2}$ to 1. Thus during all the period prior to 1873 this country enjoyed bimetallicism and, although at one time we used one metal and at another time another, no statesman arose to demand a single standard. We now have three kinds of bimetallicists—those who favor a double standard only by in-

ternational agreement, those who favor independent action at a changed ratio, and those who favor independent action at the present ratio. Those favoring an international agreement might be again divided into those who favor an agreement by a few nations, those who favor an agreement by many nations, and those who favor it only on condition that all nations would join.

I suppose it would hardly be proper to further divide them into those who really desire an international agreement and those who utilize the possibility of an international agreement to prevent independent action. I am afraid the agreement will not be brought about by those who, like the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Harter), are willing to try it, but have no faith in its permanency; nor will it receive much aid, I fear, from the gentleman from New York (Mr. Hendrix), who said on last Saturday:

I predict to you that inside of three months—before this Congress meets again—if you repeal this Sherman law and adjourn, England will make proposals to this country to come into a monetary conference and see what can be done for the sake of her ward, India.

Less than five minutes before he had pierced the veil of the future with prophetic ken and declared:

The moving finger of Time, down from the days when gold started in the race for first place to this moment, has pointed to a single unit of value. It is our destiny. It will triumph in this Hall—perhaps not in this Congress nor in your day; but it is going to become the financial policy of this country just as sure as to-morrow morning's sun will rise.

Any hope of bimetallism there?

What is the prospect for the establishment of international bimetallism? I would be glad to see the unlimited coinage of gold and silver at a fixed ratio among the nations, but how is such an agreement to be secured? The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Rayner) says the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law will bring England to terms. Is it impossible to extract a lion's teeth without putting your head in his mouth? Is it not a dangerous experiment to join England in a single standard in order to induce her to join us in a double standard? International agreement is an old delusion and has done important duty on many previous occasions.

The opponents of the Bland law in 1878 were waiting for international bimetallism. Mr. Cleveland mentioned the prospect of it in his message in 1885, and again this year. It was a valuable weapon in 1890, when the Sherman bill was passed and the Brussels conference was called in time to carry us over the last Presidential election. We are still waiting, and those are waiting most patiently who favor a gold standard. Are we any nearer to an international agreement than we were fifteen years ago? The European nations wait on England, and she refused within a year to even consider the adoption of the double standard. Can we conquer her by waiting? We have tried the Fabian policy.

Suppose we try bringing her to terms by action. Let me appeal to your patriotism. Shall we make our laws dependent upon England's action and thus allow her to legislate for us upon the most important of all questions? Shall we confess our inability to enact monetary laws? Are we an English colony or an independent people? If the use of gold alone is to make us slaves, let us use both metals and be free. If there be some living along the eastern coast—better acquainted with the beauties of the Alps than with the grandeur of the Rockies, more accustomed to the sunny skies of Italy than to the invigorating breezes of the Mississippi Valley—who are not willing to trust their fortunes and their destinies to American citizens, let them learn that the people living between the Alleghanies to the Golden Gate are not afraid to cast their all upon the Republic and rise or fall with it.

One hundred and seventeen years ago the liberty bell gave notice to a waiting and expectant people that independence had been declared. There may be doubting, trembling ones among us now, but, sirs, I do not overestimate it when I say that out of twelve millions of voters, more than ten millions are waiting, anxiously waiting, for the signal which shall announce the financial independence of the United States. This Congress cannot more surely win the approval of a grateful people than by declaring that this nation, the grandest which the world has ever seen, has the right and the ability to legislate for its own people on every subject, regardless of the wishes, the entreaties, or the threats of foreign powers.

Perhaps the most important question for us to consider is the question of ratio. Comparatively few people in this country are in favor of a gold standard, and no national party has ever advocated it. Comparatively few, also, will be deceived by the promise of international bimetallism annually held out to us. Among those in favor of bimetallism, and in favor of independent action on the part of the United States, there is, however, an honest difference of opinion as to the particular ratio at which the unlimited coinage of gold and silver should be undertaken. The principle of bimetallism does not stand upon any certain ratio, and may exist at 1 to 30 as well as at 1 to 16.

In fixing the ratio we should select that one which will secure the greatest advantage to the public and cause the least injustice. The present ratio, in my judgment, should be adopted. A change in the ratio could be made (as in 1834) by reducing the size of the gold dollar or by increasing the size of the silver dollar, or by making a change in the weight of both dollars. A large silver dollar would help the creditor. A smaller gold dollar would help the debtor. It is not just to do either, but if a change must be made the benefit should be given to the debtor rather than to the creditor.

Let no one accuse me of defending the justness of any change; but I repeat it, if we are given a choice between a change which will aid the debtor by reducing the size of his

debt and a change which will aid the creditor by increasing the amount which he is to receive, either by increasing the number of his dollars or their size, the advantage must be given to the debtor, and no man during this debate, whatever may be his private wish or interest, will advocate the giving of the advantage to the creditor.

To illustrate the effect of changing the ratio let us take, for convenience, the ratio of 24 to 1, as advocated by some. We could make this change by reducing the weight of the gold dollar one-third. This would give to the holders of gold an advantage of some \$200,000,000, but the creditors would lose several billions of dollars in the actual value of their debts. A debt contracted before 1873 would not be scaled, because the new gold dollar would purchase as much as the old gold dollar would in 1873. Creditors, however, whose loans have been made since that time would suffer, and the most recent loans would show the greatest loss. The value of silver bullion has only fallen in relation to gold. But the purchasing power of one ounce of silver has varied less since 1873 than has the purchasing power of one ounce of gold, which would indicate that gold had risen.

If, on the other hand, the ratio is changed by increasing the size of the silver dollar, it would be necessary to recoin our silver dollars into dollars a half larger, or we would have in circulation two legal tender silver dollars of different sizes. Of the two plans it would be better, in my judgment, to keep both dollars in circulation together, though unequal in weight, rather than to recoin the lighter dollars. The recoinage of more than 500,000,000 of silver dollars, or the bullion representing them, would cause a shrinkage of about \$170,000,000, or one-third of our silver money; it would cause a shrinkage of nearly one-sixth of our metallic money and of more than one-tenth of our total circulation. This contraction would increase our debts more than a billion dollars and decrease the nominal value of our property more than five billions.

A change in the ratio made by increasing the size of the silver dollar as above suggested would also decrease by one-third the number of dollars which could be coined from the annual product of silver. If, as Mr. Carlisle has said, the supply of metal, both gold and silver, is none too large to keep pace with population, the increase in the weight of each dollar would make the supply to that extent deficient. A change in ratio, whether secured by decreasing the gold dollar or by increasing the silver dollar, would probably make an international agreement more difficult, because nearly all of the silver coin now in existence circulates at a ratio less than ours.

If the change should be made in this country by increasing the size of the silver dollar and an international agreement secured upon the new ratio, to be effected by other nations in the same way, the amount of money in the world, that is metallic money, would suffer a contraction of more than \$1,000,000,000, to the enormous injury of the debtor class and to the

enormous advantage of the creditor class. If we believe that the value of gold has risen because its supply has not increased as fast as the demand caused by favorable legislation, then it would be unfair to continue this appreciation by other legislation favorable to gold. It would be a special injustice to the mine owner and to the farmer, whose products have fallen with silver, to make perpetual the injunction against their prosperity.

We often hear our opponents complain of the "cupidity of the mine owner." Let us admit that the mine owner is selfish, and that he will profit by the increased price of silver bullion. Let us, for the sake of argument, go further, and accuse him of favoring the free coinage of silver solely for the purpose of increasing the price of his product. Does that make him worse than other men? Is not the farmer selfish enough to desire a higher price for wheat? Is not the cotton-grower selfish enough to desire a higher price for his cotton? Is not the laboring man selfish enough to desire higher wages? And, if I may be pardoned for the boldness, are not bankers and business men selfish enough to ask for legislation at our hands which will give them prosperity? Was not this extraordinary session called in order to bring back prosperity to our business men?

Is it any more important that you should keep a mercantile house from failing than that you should keep a mine from suspending? Are those who desire free coinage of silver in order that the barren wastes should be made to "blossom like the rose" any worse than those who want the Sherman law repealed in order to borrow foreign gold and retire clearing house certificates? There is a class of people whose interest in financial legislation is too often overlooked. The money-loaner has just as much interest in the rise in the value of his product—money—as farmers and miners have in the increased price of their products.

The man who has \$10,000 in money becomes worth \$20,000 in reality when prices fall one-half. Shall we assume that the money lenders of this and other countries ignore the advantage which an appreciated currency gives to them and desire it simply for the benefit of the poor man and the laborer? What refining influence is there in their business which purges away the dross of selfishness and makes pure and patriotic only their motives? Has some new dispensation reversed the parable and left Lazarus in torment while Dives is borne aloft in Abraham's bosom?

But is the silver miner after all so selfish as to be worthy of censure? Does he ask for some new legislation or for some innovation inaugurated in his behalf? No. He pleads only for the restoration of the money of the fathers. He asks only to have given back to him a right which he enjoyed from 1792 to 1873. During all those years he could deposit his silver bullion at the mints and receive full legal tender coins at the rate of \$1.29 for each ounce of silver, and during a part of the

time his product could be converted into money at even a higher price. Free coinage can only give back to him what demonetization took away. He does not ask for a silver dollar redeemable in a gold dollar, but for a silver dollar which redeems itself.

If the bullion value of silver has not been reduced by hostile legislation, the free coinage of silver at the present ratio can bring to the mine owner no benefit, except by enabling him to pay a debt already contracted with less ounces of silver. If the price of his product has been reduced by hostile legislation, is he asking any more than we would ask under the same circumstances in seeking to remove the oppressive hand of the law? Let me suggest, too, that those who favor an international agreement are estopped from objecting to the profits of the silver mine owner, because an international agreement could only be effected at some ratio near to ours, probably $15\frac{1}{2}$ to 1, and this would just as surely inure to the benefit of the owner of silver as would free coinage established by the independent action of this country.

If our opponents were correct in asserting that the price of silver bullion could be maintained at 129 cents an ounce by international agreement, but not by our separate action, then international bimetalism would bring a larger profit to the mine owner than the free coinage of silver by this country could. Let the international bimetalist, then, find some better objection to free coinage than that based on the mine owner's profit.

But what is the mine owner's profit? Has anyone told you the average cost of mining an ounce of silver? You have heard of some particular mine where silver can be produced at a low cost, but no one has attempted to give you any reliable data as to the average cost of production. I had a letter from Mr. Leech when he was Director of the Mint, saying that the Government is in possession of no data in regard to the cost of gold production and none of any value in regard to silver. No calculation can be made as to the profits of mining which does not include money spent in prospecting and in mines which have ceased to pay, as well as those which are profitably worked.

When we see a wheel of fortune with twenty-four paddles, see those paddles sold for 10 cents apiece, and see the holder of the winning paddle draw \$2, we do not conclude that money can be profitably invested in a wheel of fortune. We know that those who bought expended altogether \$2.40 on the turn of the wheel, and that the man who won only received \$2; but our opponents insist upon estimating the profits of silver mining by the cost of the winning paddle. It is safe to say that taking the gold and silver of the world—and it is more true of silver than of gold—every dollar's worth of metal has cost a dollar. It is strange that those who watch so carefully lest the silver miner shall receive more for his product than the bare cost of production ignore the more fortunate gold miner.

Did you ever hear a monometallist complain because a man could produce 25.8 grains of gold, .9 fine, at any price whatever, and yet take it to our mint and have it stamped into a dollar with full legal tender qualities? I saw at the World's Fair a few days ago a nugget of gold, just as it was found, worth over \$3,000. What an outrage that the finder should be allowed to convert that into money at such an enormous profit! And yet no advocate of honest money raises his hand to stop that crime.

The fact is that the price of gold and silver does not depend upon the cost of production, but upon the law of supply and demand. It is true that production will stop when either metal cannot be produced at a profit; but so long as the demand continues equal to the supply the value of an ounce of either metal may be far above the cost of production. With most kinds of property a rise in price will cause increased production; for instance, if the price of wheat rises faster than the price of other things, there will be a tendency to increased production until the price falls; but this tendency cannot be carried out in the case of the precious metals, because the metals must be found before it can be produced, and finding is uncertain.

Between 1800 and 1849 an ounce of gold or silver would exchange for more of other things than it would from 1849 to 1873, yet during the latter period the production of both gold and silver greatly increased. It will be said that the purchasing power of an ounce of metal fell because of the increased supply; but that fall did not check production, nor has the rise in the purchasing power of an ounce of gold since 1873 increased the production. The production of both gold and silver is controlled so largely by chance as to make some of the laws applicable to other property inapplicable to the precious metals. If the supply of gold decreases without any diminution of the demand the exchangeable value of each ounce of gold is bound to increase, although the cost of producing the gold may continue to fall.

Why do not the advocates of gold monometallism recognize and complain of the advantage given to gold by laws which increase the demand for it and, therefore, the value of each ounce? Instead of that they confine themselves to the denunciation of the silver-mine owner. I have never advocated the use of either gold or silver as the means of giving employment to miners, nor has the defense of bimetallism been conducted by those interested in the production of silver. We favor the use of gold and silver as money because money is a necessity and because these metals, owing to special fitness, have been used from time immemorial. The entire annual supply of both metals, coined at the present ratio, does not afford too large a sum of money.

If, as is estimated, two-thirds of the \$130,000,000 of gold produced annually are consumed in the arts, only \$46,000,000—or less than we need for this country alone—are left to coin-

age. If one-sixth of the \$185,000,000 of silver produced annually is used in the arts, \$155,000,000 are left for coinage. India has been in the habit of taking about one-third of that sum. Thus the total amount of gold and silver annually available for all the people of all the world is only about \$200,000,000, or about four times what we need in this country to keep pace with increasing population. And as population increases the annual addition to the money must also increase.

The total sum of metallic money is a little less than \$8,000,000,000. The \$200,000,000 per annum is about two-and-a-half per cent. on the total volume of metallic money, taking no account of lost coins and shrinkage by abrasion. To quote again the language of Mr. Carlisle:

Mankind will be fortunate indeed if the annual production of gold coin shall keep pace with the annual increase of population, commerce, and industry.

An increase of the silver dollar one-third by an international agreement would reduce by 50,000,000 the number of dollars which would be coined from the annual product of silver, which would amount to a decrease of about one-fourth of the entire increase of metallic money, while the abandonment of silver entirely would destroy three-quarters of the annual increase in metallic money, or possibly all of it, if we take into consideration the reduction of the gold supply by the closing of gold-producing silver mines.

Thus it is almost certain that without silver the sum of metallic money would remain stationary, if not actually decrease, from year to year, while population increases and new enterprises demand, from time to time, a larger sum of currency. Thus it will be seen that the money question is broader than the interest of a few mine owners. It touches every man, woman, and child in all the world, and affects those in every condition of life and society.

The interest of the mine owner is incidental. He profits by the use of silver as money just as the gold miner profits by the use of gold as money; just as the newspaper profits by the law compelling the advertising of foreclosures; just as the seaport profits by the deepening of its harbor; just as the horse seller would profit by a war which required the purchase of a large number of horses for cavalry service, or just as the undertaker would profit by the decent burial of a pauper at public expense.

All of these receive an incidental benefit from public acts. Shall we complain if the use of gold and silver as money gives employment to men, builds up cities, and fills our mountains with life and industry? Shall we oppress all debtors and derange all business agreements in order to prevent the producers of money metals from obtaining for them more than actual cost? We do not reason that way in other things; why suppress the reason in this matter because of cultivated prejudices against the white metal? But what interest has the farm-

er in this subject, you may ask. The same that every laboring man has in a currency sufficient to carry on the commerce and business of a country. The employer cannot give work to men unless he can carry on the business at a profit, and he is hampered and embarrassed by a currency which appreciates because of its insufficiency.

The farmer labors under a double disadvantage. He not only suffers as a producer from all those causes which reduce the price of property, but he is thrown into competition with the products of India. Without Indian competition his lot would be hard enough for if he is a land owner he finds his capital decreasing with an appreciating standard, and if he owes on the land he finds his equity of redemption extinguished. The last census shows a real estate mortgage indebtedness in the five great agricultural States—Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska—of more than one billion of dollars. A rising standard means a great deal of distress to these mortgagors. But as I said, the producers of wheat and cotton have a special grievance, for the prices of those articles are governed largely by the prices in Liverpool, and as silver goes down our prices fall, while the rupee price remains the same. I quote from the agricultural report of 1890, page 8:

The recent legislation looking to the restoration of the bimetallic standard of our currency, and the consequent enhancement of the value of silver, has unquestionably had much to do with the recent advance in the price of cereals. The same cause has advanced the price of wheat in Russia and India, and in the same degree reduced their power of competition. English gold was formerly exchanged for cheap silver and wheat purchased with the cheaper metal was sold in Great Britain for gold. Much of this advantage is lost by the appreciation of silver in those countries. It is reasonable, therefore, to expect much higher prices for wheat than have been received in recent years.

Mr. Rusk's reasoning is correct. Shall we by changing the ratio fix the price of wheat and cotton at the present low price? If it is possible to do so it is no more than fair that we restore silver to its former place, and thus give back to the farmer some of his lost prosperity. Can silver be maintained on a parity with gold at the present ratio? It has been shown that if we should fail and our effort should result in a single silver standard it would be better for us than the adoption of the gold standard—that is, that the worst that could come from the attempt would be far better than the best that our opponents could offer us.

It has been shown that dangers and disadvantages attend a change of ratio. It may now be added that no change in the ratio can be made with fairness or intelligence without first putting gold and silver upon a perfect equality in order to tell what the natural ratio is. If a new ratio is necessary, who can tell just what that ratio ought to be? Who knows to what extent the divergence between gold and silver is due to natural laws and to what extent it is due to artificial laws? We know that the mere act of India in suspending free coinage, although she continues to buy and coin on government account,

reduced the price of silver more than 10 cents per ounce. Can anyone doubt that the restoration of free coinage in that country would increase the bullion price of silver? Who doubts that the free coinage of silver by the United States would increase its bullion price?

The only question is how much. Is it only a guess, for no one can state with mathematical precision what the rise would be. The full use of silver, too, would stop the increased demand for gold, and thus prevent any further rise in its price. It is because no one can speak with certainty that I insist that no change in the ratio can be intelligently made until both metals are offered equal privileges at the mint. When we have the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the present ratio, then, and then only, can we tell whether any of the apparent fall in the bullion price of silver is due to circumstances over which we have no control, if so, how much? If this experiment should demonstrate the necessity for a change of ratio it can be easily made, and should be made in such a way as to cause the least injury to society. But we can, in my judgment, maintain the parity at the present ratio. I state this without hesitation, notwithstanding the fact that our opponents do not disguise the contempt which they feel for one who can believe this possible. If the past teaches anything it teaches the possibility of this country maintaining the parity alone. The Royal Commission of England stated in its report that France did maintain the parity at $15\frac{1}{2}$ to 1, although she has not half our population, or enterprise. During the years when her mint laws controlled the price of gold and silver bullion the changes in the relative production of gold and silver were greater than they have been since. At one time before 1873 the value of the silver product was related to the value of the gold product as 3 to 1, while at another time the relation was reversed, and the production of gold to silver was as 3 to 1.

No such changes have occurred since; and the present value of the silver product is only $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 of gold. Much of the prejudice against silver is due to the fact that it has been falling as compared to gold. Let it begin to rise and it will become more acceptable as a money metal. Goschen, at the Paris Conference, very aptly stated the condition when he said:

At present there is a vicious circle. States are afraid of employing silver on account of the depreciation, and the depreciation continues because States refuse to employ it.

Let that "vicious circle" be broken and silver will resume its rightful place. We believe, in other words, that the opening of our mints to the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at 16 to 1 would immediately result in restoring silver to the coinage value of \$1.29 per ounce, not only here, but everywhere. That there could be no difference between the dollar coined and the same weight of silver uncoined, when one could be exchanged for the other, needs no argument.

We do not believe that the gold dollar would go to a premium, because it could not find a better coinage ratio elsewhere, and because it could be put to no purpose for which a silver dollar would not be as good. If our ratio were 1 to 14 our gold would of course be exchanged for silver; but with our ratio of 16 to 1 gold is worth more here than abroad, and foreign silver would not come here, because it is circulating at home at a better ratio than we offer.

We need not concern ourselves, therefore, about the coin silver. All that we have to take care of is the annual product from the mines, about 40 per cent. of which is produced in this country. Under the Sherman law we furnish a market for about one-third of the world's annual product. I believe about one-sixth is used in the arts, which would leave about one-half for all the rest of the world. India has suspended free coinage temporarily, in anticipation of the repeal of the Sherman law. The Herschell report expressly states that the action was necessary, because no agreement with the United States could be secured. The language is as follows:

In a dispatch of the 30th of June, 1892, the government of India expressed the deliberate opinion that, if it became clear that the Brussels conference was unlikely to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion, and if a direct agreement between India and the United States were found to be unattainable, the government of India should at once close their mints to the free coinage of silver and make arrangements for the introduction of the gold standard.

There is no doubt of the restoration of free coinage in India if this Government takes the lead, and with India taking the usual amount, but one-sixth of the annual supply is left for the other silver-using countries. There can be no flood of silver, nor will prices rise to any considerable extent—except the price of silver itself and a few of the staple products of agriculture which have fallen with silver because of India's competition. General prices cannot rise unless the total number of dollars increases more rapidly than the need for dollars, which has been shown to be impossible. The danger is, that taking all the gold and all the silver, we will not have enough money, and that there will still be some appreciation in the standard of value.

To recapitulate, then, there is not enough of either metal to form the basis for the world's metallic money; both metals must therefore be used as full legal tender primary money. There is not enough of both metals to more than keep pace with the increased demand for money; silver cannot be retained in circulation as a part of the world's money if the United States abandons it. This nation must, therefore, either retain the present law or make some further provision for silver. The only rational plan is to use both gold and silver at some ratio with equal privileges at the Mint. No change in the ratio can be made intelligently until both metals are put on an equality at the present ratio. The present ratio should be adopted if the parity can be maintained; and, lastly, it can be.

If these conclusions are correct what must be our action on the bill to unconditionally repeal the Sherman law? The Sherman law has a serious defect; it treats silver as a commodity rather than as a money, and thus discriminates between silver and gold. The Sherman law was passed in 1890 as a substitute for what was known as the Bland law. It will be remembered that the Bland law was forced upon the silver men as a compromise, and that the opponents of silver sought its repeal from the day it was passed. It will also be remembered that the Sherman law was in like manner forced upon the silver men as a compromise, and that the opponents of silver have sought its repeal ever since it became a law. The law provides for the compulsory purchase of 54,000,000 ounces of silver per year, and for the issue of Treasury notes thereon at the gold value of the bullion.

These notes are a legal tender and are redeemable in gold or silver at the option of the Government. There is also a clause in the law which states that it is the policy of this Government to maintain the parity between the metals. The Administration, it seems, has decided that the parity can only be maintained by violating a part of the law and giving the option to the holder instead of to the Government. Without discussing the administration of the law let us consider the charges made against it.

The main objection which we heard last spring was that the Treasury notes were used to draw gold out of the Treasury. If that objection were a material one the bill might easily be amended so as to make the Treasury notes hereafter issued redeemable only in silver, like the silver certificates issued under the Bland law. But the objection is scarcely important enough for consideration. While the Treasury notes have been used to draw out gold, they need not have been used for that purpose, for we have \$346,000,000 worth of greenbacks with which gold can be drawn, so long as the Government gives the option to the holder. If all of the Treasury notes were destroyed the greenbacks are sufficient to draw out the \$100,000,000 reserve three times over, and then they can be re-issued and used again. To complain of the Treasury notes while the greenbacks remain is like finding fault because the gate is open when the whole fence is down, and reminds me of the man who made a box for his feline family, and cut a big hole for the cat to go in at and a little hole for the kittens to go in at, forgetting that the large hole would do for cats of all sizes.

Just at this time the law is being made the scapegoat upon which all our financial ills are loaded, and its immediate and unconditional repeal is demanded as the sole means by which prosperity can be restored to a troubled people.

The main accusation against it now is that it destroys confidence and that foreign money will not come here, because the holder is afraid that we will go to a silver standard. The exportation of gold has been pointed to as conclusive evidence that frightened English bondholders were throwing American

securities upon the market and selling them to our people in exchange for gold. But now gold is coming back faster than it went away, and still we have the Sherman law unrepealed. Since that theory will not explain both the export and import of gold, let us accept a theory which will. The balance of trade has been largely against us during the last year, and gold went abroad to pay it, but now our exportation of bread-stuffs has increased and the gold is returning. Its going was aggravated by the fact that Austria-Hungary was gathering in gold for resumption and was compelled to take a part from us. Instead of using that export of gold as a reason for going to a gold basis, it ought to make us realize the danger of depending solely upon a metal which some other nation may deprive us of at a critical moment.

Mr. Cannon of Illinois. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. Bryan. Certainly.

Mr. Cannon of Illinois. I am in complete harmony with what my friend is saying now. I ask him if he will allow me to request him not to omit to state that in the twelve months ending June 30 last this same balance of trade that was against us not only took the gold of the United States, but nearly \$17,000,000 of silver as well.

Mr. Bryan. I think the statement made by the gentleman is correct.

The Sherman law fails utterly to account for present stringency. Let me suggest a more reasonable cause for the trouble. Last spring an attempt was made to secure the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law. We had no panic then, but the same forces which have always opposed any legislation favorable to silver demanded that the purchase of bullion should stop. Some who believe that 15 per cent. reserve makes a bank safe became frightened lest a 25 or 30 per cent. reserve might not be sufficient to make the Government safe, and wanted an issue of gold bonds. The great argument used in favor of both these propositions was that money was being drawn from the Treasury and sent to Europe; that confidence was being destroyed and that a panic would follow. They emphasized and magnified the evils which would follow the departure of gold; they worked themselves and their associates into a condition of fright which did cause financial stringency. Like the man who innocently gives the alarm of fire in a crowded hall, they excited a panic which soon got beyond control.

The trouble now is that depositors have withdrawn their deposits from the banks for fear of loss, and the banks are compelled to draw in their loans to protect their reserves, and thus men who do business upon borrowed capital are crippled. The people have not lost faith in the Government or in the Government's money. They do not refuse silver or silver certificates. They are glad enough to get any kind of money. We were told last spring that gold was going to a premium,

but recently in New York City men found a profitable business in the selling of silver certificates of small denominations at 2 per cent. premium, and on the 5th of this month there appeared in the New York Herald and the New York Times this advertisement:

WANTED—SILVER DOLLARS.—We desire to purchase at a premium of $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., or \$7.50 per thousand, standard silver dollars, in sums of \$1,000 or more, in return for our certified checks payable through the clearing-house.

ZIMMERMAN & FORSHAY, Bankers, 11 Wall Street.

About the same time the New York police force was paid in \$20 gold pieces because of the scarcity of other kinds of money. How many of the failing banks have obeyed the law in regard to reserve? How many have crippled themselves by loaning too much to their officers and directors? The situation can be stated in a few words: Money cannot be secured to carry on business because the banks have no money to loan; banks have no money to loan because the depositors have withdrawn their money; depositors have withdrawn their money because they fear the solvency of the banks; enterprises are stagnant because money is not in circulation.

Will a repeal of the Sherman law cure these evils? Can you cure hunger by a famine? I know that there are some who tell us that we have plenty of money. If I may be pardoned for a personal allusion, their attitude reminds me of a remark made by my father-in-law just after he intrusted his daughter to my care. "William," said he, laying his hand affectionately on my head, "while I have we shall not both want." Others say, "What is the use of having more money? We cannot get it unless we have something to sell." That is true; but the price of what we sell depends largely upon the amount of money in circulation. How can we pay our debts without selling something, and how can we sell anything unless there is money in circulation to buy with? We need money. The Sherman law supplies a certain amount. Will the stringency be relieved by suspending that issue? If the advocates of repeal would take for their battle cry, "Stop issuing money," instead of "Stop buying silver," would not their purpose be more plain? But they say the repeal of the law will encourage foreign capital to come here by giving assurance that it will be repaid on a gold basis. Can we afford to buy confidence at that price? Can we afford to abandon the constitutional right to pay in either gold or silver in order to borrow foreign gold with the certainty of having to pay it back in appreciated dollars? To my mind, Mr. Speaker, the remedy proposed seems not only dangerous and absurd, but entirely inadequate. Why try to borrow foreign capital in order to induce the people in this country to redeposit their savings in the banks?

Why do not these financiers apply the remedy to the diseased part? If the gentleman from New York (Mr. Hendrix), to whom I listened with pleasure, and who said, "I have conic

into this Hall as a banker, I am here as the president of a national bank," desires to restore confidence, let him propose for the consideration of the members a bill to raise, by a small tax upon deposits, a sum sufficient to secure depositors against possible loss; or a bill to compel stockholders to put up security for their double liability; or to prevent stockholders or officers from wrecking a bank to carry on their private business; or to limit the liabilities which a bank can assume upon a given amount of capital, so that there will be more margin to protect its creditors; or a bill to make more severe the punishment for embezzlement, so that a man cannot rob a bank of a half million and escape with five years, and cannot be boarded at a hotel by a marshal, while the small thief suffers in a dungeon. Let him propose some real relief and this House will be glad to co-operate with him.

Or, if there is immediate relief necessary in the increased issue of paper money, let our financiers press the suggestion made by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Johnson), viz., that the holders of Government bonds be allowed to deposit them and draw the face in Treasury notes by remitting the interest and with the power of redeeming the bonds at any time. This will give immediate relief and will save the Government interest on the bonds while the money is out. But no, the only remedy proposed by these financiers at this time, when business is at a standstill and when men are suffering unemployed, is a remedy which will enable them to both control the currency and reap pecuniary profit through its issue.

One of the benefits of the Sherman law, so far as the currency is concerned, is that it compels the issue of a large amount of money annually, and but for this issue the present financial panic would, in my judgment, be far more severe than it is. That we need an annual increase in the currency is urged by Mr. Sherman himself in a speech advocating the passage of the Sherman law. On the 5th day of June, 1890, he said in the Senate:

Under the law of February, 1878, the purchase of \$2,000,000 worth of silver bullion a month has by coinage produced annually an average of nearly \$3,000,000 per month for a period of twelve years, but this amount, in view of the retirement of the bank notes, will not increase our currency in proportion to our increasing population. If our present currency is estimated at \$1,400,000,000, and our population is increasing at the ratio of 3 per cent. per annum, it would require \$12,000,000 increased circulation each year to keep pace with the increase of population; but as the increase of population is accompanied by a still greater ratio of increase of wealth and business, it was thought that an immediate increase of circulation might be obtained by larger purchases of silver bullion to an amount sufficient to make good the requirement of bank notes and keep pace with the growth of population. Assuming that \$4,000,000 a year of additional currency is needed upon this basis, that amount is provided for in this bill by the issue of Treasury notes in exchange for bullion at the market price.

This amount, by the fall in the price of bullion silver, has been largely reduced. Shall we wipe it out entirely? He insisted that the Sherman law gave to the people more money than the Bland law, and upon that ground its passage was

defended before the people. Could it have been passed had it given less than the Bland law? Who would have dared to defend it if it had provided for no money at all?

What provision shall be made for the future? Upon that question our opponents are silent. The bill which they have proposed leaves us with no increased currency provided for. Some of the advocates of a gold standard, in the defense of their theory, find it necessary to dispute every well-established principle of finance.

We are told that as civilization increases credit takes the place of money and that the volume of real money can be diminished without danger. That recalls the experience of the man who conceived the idea that a fish could be made to live without water. As the story goes, he put a herring, fresh from the sea, in a jar of salt water. By removing a little every morning and adding rainwater he gradually accustomed it to fresh water. Then by gradually removing the fresh water he accustomed it to air and finally kept it in a cage like a bird. One day, in his absence, his servant placed a cup of water in the cage in order that the fish might moisten its food; but alas! when the master came home he found that the fish had thoughtlessly put its head into the water and drowned!

From the arguments of some of our opponents we might be led to the conclusion that the time would come when money would not only be unnecessary but really dangerous.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is whether we shall increase our supply of primary money, as we do when we increase our gold and silver, or whether we shall increase our promises to pay real money, as we do when we increase national bank notes.

Mr. Bland. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

Mr. Bryan. Yes, sir.

Mr. Bland. The Treasury notes issued under the law for the purchase of the silver bullion are legal tender for all debts public and private, and not like bank notes, mere credit money.

Mr. Bryan. I understand that. I say they are primary money; although it if were construed to mean that they were merely a promise to pay gold, then they would be simply credit money to that extent.

Mr. Bland. The distinction I wish to draw is this, that those Treasury notes issued in purchase of silver bullion are legal tender while a bank note is not.

Mr. Bryan. And the distinction is a very just one.

The larger the superstructure of credit, as related to the basis of metal, the more unsubstantial our system. If we present a bank note for payment we receive a greenback; if we present a greenback for payment, the treasurer has a right to pay in silver dollars, and now our opponents want it understood that a silver dollar is only a promise to pay a gold dollar. Is that sound money?

No, Mr. Speaker; if metallic money is sound money, then we who insist upon a base broad enough to support a currency

redeemable in coin on demand, are the real friends of sound money, and those are "dangerous fiatists" who would make the metallic base so narrow as to compel the Government to abandon it for the preservation of its people. If all the currency is built upon the small basis of gold those who hold the gold will be the masters of the situation. We have a right to demand that the future financial policy shall be a part of the repealing act, so that we may choose between it and what we have and reject it if it is less favorable than the present law. And I may add in the language adopted by the bimetallic league a few days ago—

The refusal of the opponents of bimetallism to propose any substitute for the present law, or to elaborate any plan for the future, indicates either an ignorance of our financial needs or an unwillingness to take the public into their confidence.

But, sir, more serious than any other objection which can be made to the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law is the incontrovertible fact that a suspension of silver would tend to lower the price of silver bullion and thus make the restoration of bimetallism more difficult. That this will be the effect is proven not only by reason, but by the utterances of Mr. Herschell's committee in discussing the finances of India. That report says:

In December last, a bill was introduced in the Senate to repeal the Sherman act, and another to suspend purchases under it. Whether any such measures will pass into law it is impossible to foretell, but it must be regarded as possible; and although, in the light of past experience, predictions on such a subject must be made with caution, it is certainly probable that the repeal of the Sherman act would be followed by a heavy fall in the price of silver.

The first question for us to decide then is, are we in favor of bimetallism or a universal gold standard? If we are in favor of bimetallism, the next question is will a fall in the bullion price of silver as measured by gold help or hinder bimetallism? We are told by those who want a gold standard that it will help bimetallism; but the query is, if it would, "why do they favor it?" It is sufficient to arouse suspicion when every advocate of gold monometallism favors unconditional repeal, and the more emphatic his advocacy of gold the more earnest his desire for repeal. Is any subsequent legislation in behalf of silver intended? If so, why not propose it now? What money lender, loaning upon a mortgage, would be willing to let the money go upon a promise that the mortgage should be delivered next week? Or what business man would cancel an obligation to-day on the promise of having the money paid to-morrow? Shall we be more careless in protecting the sacred interests of our constituencies than a business man is in transacting his business?

What excuse can we give to our people for releasing what we have with the expectation of getting something in the future when the advocates of repeal boldly demand, upon this floor, the adoption of a universal gold standard, and predict

that its coming is as certain as the rising of to-morrow's sun. Read the utterances of these leaders in the crusade against silver. Read the famous article of the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. Cockran). Read the article in the Forum of last February, from the pen of Hon. George Fred Williams, who, in the last Congress, spoke for those demanding unconditional repeal:

In the efforts which have thus far been made toward a repeal, a single question has been repeated by the silver men so often as to give a plain indication to the situation. What, it is asked, do you propose to put in place of silver purchases? There never was a time more opportune to answer definitely this question with the single word, nothing.

Let me join issue upon this question, and say that the time will never come in this country when that word "nothing" will be accepted as a satisfactory answer.

They tell us that our platform demands repeal, but does it demand repeal only? Shall we take away the "cowardly makeshift" before we restore the real thing for which that "temporary expedient" was substituted? As well denounce one kind of food because it lacks nourishment and then refuse all food to the patient. They shall not be permitted to thus mutilate the platform. No such inexcusable attempt at garbling has been witnessed since the minister took from the sentence "Let him which is on the house-top not come down to take anything out of his house" the words "topnot come down," and inveighed against the feminine habit of wearing the hair in a knot on the top of the head. They demand of us unconditional repeal. They demand that we give up all that we have in the way of silver legislation before we know what we are to receive. Shall we surrender on these terms? Rollin tells us that the third Punic war was declared by the Romans and that a messenger was sent to Carthage to announce the declaration after the army had started on its way. The Carthaginians at once sent representatives to treat for peace. The Romans first demanded the delivery of three hundred hostages before they would enter into negotiations. When three hundred sons of the nobles had been given into their hands they demanded the surrender of all the arms and implements of war before announcing the terms of the treaty. The conditions were sorrowfully but promptly complied with, and the people who boasted of a Hannibal and a Hamilcar gave up to their ancient enemies every weapon of offense and defense. Then the Roman consul, rising up before the humiliated representatives of Carthage, said:

I cannot but commend you for the readiness with which you have obeyed every order. The decree of the Roman Senate is that Carthage shall be destroyed.

Sirs, what will be the answer of the people whom you represent, who are wedded to the "gold and silver coinage of the Constitution," if you vote for unconditional repeal and return to tell them that you were commended for the readiness

with which you obeyed every order, but that Congress has decreed that one-half of the people's metallic money shall be destroyed?

They demand unconditional surrender, do they? Why, sirs, we are the ones to grant terms. Standing by the pledges of all the parties in this country, backed by the history of a hundred years, sustained by the most sacred interests of humanity itself, we demand an unconditional surrender of the principle of gold monometallism as the first condition of peace. You demand surrender! Ay, sirs, you may cry "Peace, peace," but there is no peace. Just so long as there are people here who would chain this country to a single gold standard, there is war—eternal war; and it might just as well be known now! I have said that we stand by the pledges of all platforms. Let me quote them:

The Populist platform adopted by the national convention in 1892 contained these words:

We demand free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1.

As the members of that party, both in the Senate and in the House, stand ready to carry out the pledge there made, no appeal to them is necessary.

The Republican national platform adopted in 1888 contains this plank:

The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money and condemns the policy of the Democratic administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

The same party in 1892 adopted a platform containing the following language:

The American people from tradition and interest favor bimetallicism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money, such restrictions to be determined by contemplation of values of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be equal at all times.

The interests of the producers of the country, its farmers and its workmen, demand that every dollar, paper or gold, issued by the Government, shall be as good as any other. We commend the wise and patriotic steps already taken by our Government to secure an international parity of value between gold and silver for use as money throughout the world.

Are the Republican members of this House ready to abandon the system which the American people favor "from tradition and interest?" Having won a Presidential election upon a platform which condemned "the policy of the Democratic administration in its efforts to demonetize silver," are they ready to join in that demonetization? Having advocated the Sherman law because it gave an increased use of silver, are they ready to repeal it and make no provisions for silver at all? Are they willing to go before the country confessing that they secured the present law by sharp practice, and only

adopted it as an ingenious device for preventing free coinage, to be repealed as soon as the hour of danger was passed?

The Democratic platform of 1880 contained these words:

Honest money, consisting of gold and silver, and paper convertible into coin on demand.

It would seem that at that time silver was honest money, although the bullion value was considerably below the coinage value.

In 1884 the Democratic platform contained this plank:

We believe in honest money, the gold and silver coinage of the Constitution, and a circulating medium convertible into such money without loss.

It would seem that at that time silver was considered honest money.

In 1888 the Democratic party did not express itself on the money question except by saying:

It renewed the pledge of its fidelity to Democratic faith, and reaffirms the platform adopted by its representatives in the convention of 1884.

Since the platform of 1884 commended silver as an honest money, we must assume that the reaffirming of that platform declared anew that silver was honest money as late as 1888, although at that time its bullion value had fallen still more.

The last utterance of a Democratic national convention upon this subject is contained in the platform adopted at Chicago in 1892. It is as follows:

We denounce the Republican legislation known as the Sherman act of 1890 as a cowardly makeshift, fraught with possibilities of danger in the future, which should make all its supporters, as well as its author, anxious for its speedy repeal. We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage, but the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value or be adjusted through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as shall insure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and to the payment of debts; and we demand that all paper currency shall be kept at par with and redeemable in such coin. We insist upon this policy as especially necessary for the protection of the farmers and laboring classes, the first and most defenseless victims of unstable money and a fluctuating currency.

Thus it will be seen that gold and silver have been indissolubly linked together in our platforms. Never in the history of the party has it taken a position in favor of a gold standard. On every vote taken in the House and Senate a majority of the party have been recorded not only in favor of bimetallicism, but for the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1.

The last platform pledges us to the use of both metals as standard money and to the free coinage of both metals at a fixed ratio. Does any one believe that Mr. Cleveland could have been elected President upon a platform declaring in

favor of the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law? Can we go back to our people and tell them that, after denouncing for twenty years the crime of 1873, we have at last accepted it as a blessing? Shall bimetalism receive its deathblow in the House of its friends, and in the very Hall where innumerable vows have been registered in its defense? What faith can be placed in platforms if their pledges can be violated with impunity? Is it right to rise above the power which created us? Is it patriotic to refuse that legislation in favor of gold and silver which a majority of the people have always demanded? Is it necessary to betray all parties in order to treat this subject in a "nonpartisan" way?

The President has recommended unconditional repeal. It is not sufficient to say that he is honest—so were the mothers, who, with misguided zeal threw their children into the Ganges. The question is not "Is he honest?" but "Is he right?" He won the confidence of the toilers of this country because he taught that "public office is a public trust," and because he convinced them of his courage and his sincerity. But are they willing to say, in the language of Job, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him?" Whence comes this irresistible demand for unconditional repeal? Are not the representatives here as near to the people and as apt to know their wishes? Whence comes the demand? Not from the workshop and the farm, not from the workmen of this country, who create its wealth in time of peace and protect its flag in time of war, but from the middle-men, from what are termed the "business interests," and largely from that class which can force Congress to let it issue money at a pecuniary profit to itself if silver is abandoned. The President has been deceived. He can no more judge the wishes of the great mass of our people by the expressions of these men than he can measure the ocean's silent depths by the foam upon its waves.

Mr. Powderly, who spoke at Chicago a few days ago in favor of the free coinage of silver at the present ratio and against the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law, voiced the sentiment of more laboring men than have ever addressed the President or this House in favor of repeal. Go among the agricultural classes; go among the poor, whose little is as precious to them as the rich man's fortune is to him, and whose families are as dear, and you will not find the haste to destroy the issue of money or the unfriendliness to silver which is manifested in money centers.

This question cannot be settled by typewritten recommendations and suggestions made by boards of trade and sent broadcast over the United States. It can only be settled by the great mass of the voters of this country who stand like the Rock of Gibraltar for the use of both gold and silver.

There are thousands, yes, tens of thousands, aye, even millions, who have not yet "bowed the knee to Baal." Let the President take courage. Muehlbach relates an incident in the life of the great military hero of France. At Marengo the

Man of Destiny, sad and disheartened, thought the battle lost. He called to a drummer boy and ordered him to beat a retreat. The lad replied:

Sire, I do not know how. Dessaix has never taught me retreat, but I can beat a charge. Oh, I can beat a charge that would make the dead fall into line! I beat that charge at the Bridge of Lodi; I beat it at Mount Tabor; I beat it at the Pyramids. Oh, may I beat it here?

The charge was ordered, the battle won, and Marengo was added to the victories of Napoleon. Oh, let our gallant leader draw inspiration from the street gamin of Paris. In the face of an enemy proud and confident the President has wavered. Engaged in the battle royal between the "money power and the common people" he has ordered a retreat. Let him not be dismayed.

He has won greater victories than Napoleon, for he is a warrior who has conquered without a sword. He restored fidelity in the public service; he converted Democratic hope into realization; he took up the banner of tariff reform and carried it to triumph. Let him continue that greater fight for "the gold and silver coinage of the Constitution," to which three national platforms have pledged him. * * * *

Well has it been said by the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Vest) that we have come to the parting of the ways. To-day the Democratic party stands between two great forces, each inviting its support. On the one side stand the corporate interests of the nation, its moneyed institutions, its aggregations of wealth and capital, imperious, arrogant, compassionless. They demand special legislation, favors, privileges, and immunities. They can subscribe magnificently to campaign funds; they can strike down opposition with their all-pervading influence, and, to those who fawn and flatter, bring ease and plenty. They demand that the Democratic party shall become their agent to execute their merciless decrees.

On the other side stands that unnumbered throng which gave a name to the Democratic party, and for which it has assumed to speak. Work-worn and dust-begrimed, they make their sad appeal. They hear of average wealth increased on every side and feel the inequality of its distribution. They see an over-production of everything desired because of the under-production of the ability to buy. They cannot pay for loyalty except with their suffrages, and can only punish betrayal with their condemnation. Although the ones who most deserve the fostering care of Government, their cries for help too often beat in vain against the outer wall, while others less deserving find ready access to legislative halls.

This army, vast and daily growing, begs the party to be its champion in the present conflict. It cannot press its claims 'mid sounds of revelry. Its phalanxes do not form in grand parade, nor has it gaudy banners floating on the breeze. Its battle hymn is "Home, Sweet Home," its war cry "equality before the law." To the Democratic party, standing between these two irreconcilable forces, uncertain to which side to

turn, and conscious that upon its choice its fate depends, come the words of Israel's second lawgiver: "Choose you this day whom ye will serve." What will the answer be? Let me invoke the memory of him whose dust made sacred the soil of Monticello when he joined

The dead but sceptered sovereigns who still rule
Our spirits from their urns.

He was called a demagogue, and his followers a mob, but the immortal Jefferson dared to follow the best promptings of his heart. He placed man above matter, humanity above property, and, spurning the bribes of wealth and power, pleaded the cause of the common people. It was this devotion to their interests which made his party invincible while he lived and will make his name revered while history endures. And what message comes to us from the Hermitage? When a crisis like the present arose and the national bank of his day sought to control the politics of the nation, God raised up an Andrew Jackson, who had the courage to grapple with that great enemy, and by overthrowing it, he made himself the idol of the people and reinstated the Democratic party in public confidence. What will the decision be to-day? The Democratic party has won the greatest success in its history. Standing upon this victory-crowned summit, will it turn its face to the rising or the setting sun? Will it choose blessings or cursings—life or death—which? Which?

THIRD SPEECH AGAINST UNCONDITIONAL REPEAL.

Mr. Speaker: Nothing that can be said at this time will affect the fate of this bill, but those gentlemen who vote for it should do so with a full and clear understanding of what they are doing. We have been told, sir, that the Democratic platform adopted in 1892 demanded the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law. No person has brought into this House a single platform utterance which will bear out that assertion. The platform does not even demand repeal, not to speak of unconditional repeal. It says: "We denounce the Republican legislation known as the Sherman act of 1890 as a cowardly makeshift fraught with possibilities of danger in the future, which should make all of its supporters, as well as its author, anxious for its speedy repeal." Its author does seem to be "anxious for its speedy repeal," and in this desire many of its supporters join with him; but why should a Democratic Congress secure that repeal without first restoring, at least, the law which the Sherman law repealed? Then, too, the denunciation contained in the platform is directed against the whole law, not simply against the purchase clause. Yet we are urged to support this bill for the unconditional repeal of the purchase clause only as a Democratic measure. What is the history of this bill? It is identical in purpose and almost identical in language with a bill introduced by Senator Sherman July 14, 1892.

To show the similarity between the bill introduced then by

Senator Sherman and the bill introduced since by Mr. Wilson, I place the two bills in parallel columns:

Fifty-second Congress, first session. S. 3423, introduced in the Senate July 14, 1892, by Mr. Sherman.

A bill for the repeal of certain parts of the act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes, approved July 14, 1890.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That so much of the act entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes," approved July 14, 1890, as directs the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase, from time to time, silver bullion to the aggregate amount of 4,500,000 ounces, or so much thereof as may be offered in each month, at the market price thereof, and to issue in payment for such purchases of silver bullion Treasury notes of the United States is hereby repealed, to take effect on the 1st day of January, 1893; Provided, That this act shall not in any way affect or impair or change the legal qualities, redemption or use of the Treasury notes issued under said act.

Fifty-third Congress, first session. H. R. 1, introduced in the House August 11, 1893, by Mr. Wilson.

A bill to repeal a part of an act, approved July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes."

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That so much of the act approved July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes," as directs the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase, from time to time, silver bullion to the aggregate amount of 4,500,000 ounces, or so much thereof as may be offered in each month, at the market price thereof, not exceeding \$1 for 371.25 grains of pure silver, and to issue in payment for such purchases Treasury notes of the United States, be, and the same is hereby repealed; but this repeal shall not impair or in any manner affect the legal-tender quality of the standard silver dollars heretofore coined; and the faith and credit of the United States are hereby pledged to maintain the parity of the standard gold and silver coins of the United States at the present legal ratio, or such other ratio as may be established by law.

Does the Senator from Ohio originate Democratic measures?

The gentlemen who favor this bill may follow the leadership of Senator Sherman and call it Democratic; but until he is converted to true principles of finance I shall not follow him, nor will I apply to his financial policy the name of Democracy or honesty. The Wilson bill passed the House, but a majority of the Democrats voted in favor of substituting the Bland law in the place of the Sherman law before they voted for unconditional repeal, showing that they were not for unconditional repeal until Republican votes had deprived them of that which they preferred to unconditional repeal, namely, the Bland law. When the bill in its present form was reported to the Senate, four of the Democratic members of the Finance Committee opposed the bill and only two Democrats favored

it. When the bill passed the Senate, twenty-two Democrats were recorded in favor of the bill and twenty-two against it, and that, too, in spite of the fact that every possible influence was brought to bear to secure Democratic support for the measure. Before a vote was reached thirty-seven Democratic Senators agreed to a compromise, so that this bill does not come to us expressing the free and voluntary desire of the Democratic party.

Not only does unconditional repeal fail to carry out the pledge made in the last national platform, but it disregards the most important part of the financial plank, in not redeeming the promise to maintain "the coinage of both gold and silver, without discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage." That promise meant something. It was a square declaration in favor of bimetallism. The tail to this bill, added in the Senate as an amendment, pretends to promise a future fulfillment of platform pledges. We are not here to promise, but to fulfill. We are not here to renew platform pledges, but to carry them out. But even if it were our duty to postpone bimetallism and record another promise, the Senate amendment does not contain the vital words of the financial plank. The Senate amendment eliminates from the platform the important declaration in favor of "the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage." To show the important difference between the senate amendment and that part of our platform, I arrange them in parallel columns:

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.

We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage, but the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value or be adjusted through international agreement, or by such safe guards of legislation as shall insure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of all debts.

THE SENATE AMENDMENT.

And it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts.

Were those important words stricken out by intention or was it simply an oversight? No, Mr. Speaker, those words were purposely left out because those who are behind the bill never



Wm Feller



H. Chilton

intend to carry out the Democratic platform; and if we can judge their purpose by their acts, those who prepared the platform never intended when it was written that it should be fulfilled after it had secured the suffrage of the American people.

When they had a strike at Homestead some time ago they used force to remedy what they considered their grievances. We said then that the ballot, not the bullet, was the means by which the American people redressed their grievances. What shall we say now when people elected upon a platform and pledged to a principle disregard those pledges when they come to the legislative halls? It is a blow at representative government which we cannot afford to give. We are not sent here because we know more than others and can think for them. We are sent here to carry out the wishes, to represent the interests, and to protect the rights of those who sent us. What defense can we make if this bill is passed? It is not demanded by the people; the farmers and laborers who constitute the great bulk of our people have never asked for it; those who speak for their organizations have never prayed for it.

So far as the laborer has been heard from, he has denounced unconditional repeal; so far as the farmer has been heard from, he has denounced unconditional repeal. Who gave the eastern capitalists the right to speak for these men? It is a contest between the producers of wealth and those who exchange or absorb it. We have heard a great deal about business interests and business men demanding repeal. Who are the business men? Are not those entitled to that name who are engaged in the production of the necessaries of life? Is the farmer less a business man than the broker, because the former spends three hundred and sixty-five days in producing a crop which will not bring him over a dollar a day for his labor, while the latter can make ten times the farmer's annual income in one successful bet on the future price of the farmer's product? I protest, Mr. Speaker, against the use of the name business men in such a way as to exclude the largest and most valuable class of business men in the country. Unconditional repeal stops the issue of money. With this law gone, no more silver certificates can be issued, and no more silver bought. There is no law to provide for the issue of greenbacks. We must rely for our additional currency upon our share of the limited supply of gold, and the bank notes which national banks may find it profitable to issue.

Does anybody deny that our currency must increase as our population increases and as our need for money increases? Does any one believe that our need for money can be supplied without affirmative legislation? Is it any more wise to destroy the present means for increasing our currency before a new plan is adopted than it would be to repeal the McKinley tariff act without putting some other revenue measure in its place? Our platform says: "We denounce the McKinley tariff

law enacted by the Fifty-first Congress as the culminating atrocity of class legislation," and "we promise its repeal as one of the beneficent results that will follow the action of the people in intrusting power to the Democratic party." We also demanded a tariff for revenue only. Is there any more reason for separating the repeal of the Sherman law from the enactment of bimetallic legislation than there is for separating the repeal of the McKinley bill from the enactment of a "tariff for revenue only" measure? Having harmonized with Mr. Sherman, shall we proceed to harmonize with Mr. McKinley? There are many Republicans who tell us now that the prospect of tariff reduction has destroyed confidence to a greater extent than the Sherman law has.

In order to avoid another manufacturer's panic will it be necessary to abandon another tenet of the Democratic faith and give up all hope of tariff reduction? Unconditional repeal will make it more difficult to restore free bimetallic coinage. It cannot aid bimetallicism without disappointing the dearest hopes of those gentlemen who are most active in its support. If it were not so serious a matter it would be interesting to note the mortification which must come either to the gold supporters or to the silver supporters of unconditional repeal. They are working in perfect harmony to secure exactly opposite results by means of this bill. Who will be deceived? This is only the first step. It will be followed by an effort to secure an issue of bonds to maintain gold payments. Senator Sherman, the new prophet of Democracy, has already stated that bonds must be issued, and we know that last spring the whole pressure of the monied interest was brought to bear to secure an issue of bonds then. Do you say that Congress would not dare to authorize the increase of the public debt in time of peace? What is there that this Congress may not dare to do after it has given its approval to the iniquitous measure now before us?

It has also been suggested that the silver dollars now on hand be limited in their legal-tender qualities. We need not be surprised if this suggestion assumes real form in attempted legislation. It has already been proposed to increase the circulation of national banks and thus approve of a policy which our party has always denounced. But we need be surprised at nothing now. The party can never undergo a more complete transformation upon any question than it has upon the silver question, if the representatives really reflect the sentiments of those who sent them here. We have been told of the great blessings which are to follow unconditional repeal. Every rise in stocks has been paraded as a forerunner of coming prosperity. I have taken occasion to examine the quotations on one of the staple products of the farm, and in order to secure a basis for calculation, I have taken wheat for December delivery.

I give below the New York quotations on December wheat, taken from the New York Price Current. The quotations

are for the first day of the months of June, July, August, September, October, and October 30, or as near those dates as could be gathered from the Price Current, which is published about twice a week.

June 1, December wheat, 83½.
 (Special session called June 30, to meet August 7.)
 July 1, December wheat, 81½.
 August 1, December wheat, 75.
 (Congress convened August 7.)
 September 1, December wheat, 74½.
 (Senate debate continuing.)
 October 1, December wheat, 74½.
 (Compromise abandoned and repeal assured about October 23.)
 October 30, December wheat, 71½.
 (Unconditional repeal passed Senate evening of October 30.)
 October 31, December wheat (post-marked report), 69½.

The following is an extract from the market report touching the general situation in New York and the grain market in Chicago. The report appears in the morning issue of the Washington Post, November 1.

Big Scramble to Sell—The Change of Sentiment Was a Surprise to the Street—London Began the Raid—Those Who Believed the Passage of the Repeal Bill Would Lead to Heavy Buying Orders, and Had Purchased for a Rise, Also Turned Sellers and Sacrificed their Holdings—Rallied a Little as the Market Closed—The Business on Change.

New York, October 31.

Yesterday's vote by the Senate repealing the Sherman silver law did not have the effect on the stock market that the bulls expected. In the first place, London cabled orders to sell various stocks, much to the disappointment of local operators, who were confident that the action of the Senate would result in a flood of buying orders. The liquidations for foreign account induced selling by operators who had added to their lines on the belief that the repeal of the silver purchase act would instantaneously bring about a boom.

When it was seen that instead of buying the outside public was disposed to sell the weak-kneed bulls tried to get out.

Chicago, October 31.

Wheat was very weak throughout the entire session to-day. The opening was about 1 cent per bushel lower than the closing figures of Saturday, became weak, and after some minor fluctuations prices further declined 1½ to 2, then held steady, and the closing was 2½ to 2¾ lower than the last prices of Saturday. There was some surprise at the course of the market, which became consternation, and at one time amounted almost to a panic, when little or no reaction appeared and the price continued to sink. The fact of the matter was that traders were loaded with wheat and were merely waiting for the opportunity to sell. The bulge toward the end of last week gave them this chance and they were quick to take advantage of it. The silver repeal bill having been discounted for several days had little or no effect in the matter of sustaining prices. New York stocks were weak and much lower and this speculative feeling was communicated to wheat. New Yorkers who have seen the big bulls for so long were selling to-day, and it was said that there were numerous orders from abroad on that side of the market.

Corn was dull, the range being within three-eighths of a cent limit. The tone was steady and at times an undertone of firmness was noticeable, although prices did not show any essential changes. The accumulations of cash corn during the past three days were the cause of a somewhat liberal offering of futures early, but after a time they became light, and the market dull. The opening was at a decline of ¼

to $\frac{3}{8}$, but on a good demand an advance of $\frac{3}{8}$ was made, receding $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{3}{8}$ later, and closing $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{3}{8}$ under the final figures of Saturday.

Oats were featureless, but the feeling was steady. There was very little trading and price changes were within $\frac{1}{4}$ cent limit, the closing being $\frac{1}{8}$ below Saturday.

From the statement given it will appear that wheat has fallen more than 14 cents a bushel since the beginning of the month in which President Cleveland issued his call for the extra session. The wheat crop for 1892 was about 500,000,000 bushels. A fall of 1 cent in price means a loss of \$5,000,000 on the crop if those figures can be taken for this year's crop. Calculated upon December wheat the loss since June 1 has been over \$70,000,000, or one-sixth of its value at the beginning of the decline. The fall of 2 cents on yesterday alone, after the repeal bill passed the Senate and its immediate passage in the House was assured, amounted to \$10,000,000. The fall yesterday in wheat, corn, and oats calculated upon a year's crop amounted to more than \$17,000,000. Are these the first fruits of repeal? Wall street was terribly agitated at the prospect of a slight reduction in the gold reserve. Will they take notice of this tremendous reduction in the farmer's reserve? The market report above quoted says:

Yesterday's vote by the Senate repealing the Sherman silver law did not have the effect on the stock market that the bulls expected. In the first place London cabled orders to sell various stocks, much to the disappointment of local operators, who were confident that the action of the Senate would result in a flood of buying orders.

Is it possible that instead of money flowing to us, it is going to flow away in spite of repeal? The argument most persistently made by the advocates of repeal was that money would at once flow to this country from Europe and relieve us of our stringency in the money market. The business centers became impatient because the Senate insisted upon a thorough discussion. Some of the papers even suggested that the Senate ought to be abolished because it stood in the way of the restoration of confidence. Finally the opposition was worn out, the bill was passed, just as the metropolitan press demanded, and behold it is greeted in the market by a general decline. We may now expect to hear that the vague, indefinite, and valueless tail added in the Senate as an amendment has prevented returning confidence, and that it is our highest duty to repeal the caudal appendage of the Wilson bill, just as the repeal of the purchase clause of the Sherman law was demanded. For twenty years we have denounced the demonetization act of 1873, and yet we are now prepared with our eyes open, fully conscious of what we are doing, to perpetrate the same crime. We leave silver just where it was left then, except that there was provision then for trade dollars which this bill does not contain. You may assume the responsibility, I shall not.

The line of battle is laid down. The President's letter to Governor Northen expresses his opposition to the free and

unlimited coinage of silver by this country alone. Upon that issue the next Congressional contest will be fought. Are we dependent or independent as a nation? Shall we legislate for ourselves or shall we beg some foreign nation to help us provide for the financial wants of our own people?

We need not fear the result of such a contest. The patriotism of the American people is not yet gone, and we can confidently await their decision.

CHAPTER X.

DEMOCRATIC DIFFERENCES.

The Republican Convention, with its sensational incidents, was followed by a season of extraordinary activity within the lines of the Democratic party. The Prohibition and Populist elements were for the time less objects of consideration among the politicians than was the growing divergence of opinion between the factions of the Democratic party. As Democratic state convention after state convention was held, it became more and more evident that the silverite wing of that party was extending its influence. In the East this influence was not so prominent, but in the West and South it spread with astonishing rapidity. It became evident some time before the convention was to be held in Chicago, July 7, that the silverites—that is those in favor of the free coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1—would have a majority of the convention, and it became later apparent that they might possibly secure the two-thirds, which, according to the time-honored Democratic precedent, were necessary for a nomination. The assembling was dramatic in every feature.

There had lately been erected in Chicago a vast structure known as the Coliseum, intended for the accommodation of such great gatherings as this, and the incoming multitude of delegates and alternates found the most

complete arrangements for the reception and for the holding of a convention on a grand scale ever known in the political history of the country. Before the arrivals of the various state delegations it was understood that the nominee would be almost to a certainty a Free Silver man, and a fierce rivalry for precedence had arisen among the candidates. Most prominent among these was the Hon. Richard P. Bland, of Missouri, known as the father of the Free Silver movement, and for many years most prominent in Congress in advocacy of the white metal. He was looked upon as the logical candidate and led easily in the beginning. Ex-Gov. Horace Boies, of Iowa, was the candidate counted second in strength, while Gov. Claude Matthews, of Indiana; Ex-Governor Pattison, of Pennsylvania; Senator Joseph Blackburn, of Kentucky; Ex-Governor Russell, of Massachusetts; and John R. McLean, of Ohio, were other candidates recognized as having more than possibilities. The representatives of Ex-Governor Boies were first in the field, and were followed swiftly by those of Bland and Matthews, Bland having apparently the lead in the contest and retaining it till the last day of the convention.

After the gathering of the delegates and before the convention opened, it was evident that the Free Silver men constituting the majority were resolved to exercise the power they possessed to the utmost to secure any action of the convention in accordance with their principles and beliefs. It was doubtful whether or not they had a two-thirds majority in the convention and so sufficient votes to nominate a President in accordance with Democratic precedent. It was determined in caucus that if necessary to secure control of the convention in the

degree required, the majority should exert its force and abandon the two-thirds rule. There were two contesting delegations of importance, one from Nebraska, and the other from Michigan. Were the Free Silver delegates from these two states to be seated, it appeared possible that it would not be necessary to abrogate the rule referred to and thus violate the provision of the Democratic party. Steps were taken by the Silver majority to meet all contingencies in this respect.

The majority of the Democratic National Committee was composed of many opposed to the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. There was a minority holding an opposite view.

It had been usual in the past for the National Committee to attend to all preliminaries and to designate those from chairman down, who should be given an official place during the temporary organization of the convention. The National Committee followed the usual precedent, and after different conferences with the silver men exercised this technical right and named temporary officials of the convention, designating for the temporary chairman the Hon. David B. Hill, of New York. At the various conferences held, fiery speeches had been made, and it had become a certainty that the difference between eastern and western delegates was likely to be something irreconcilable. The convention finally assembled, with a prevailing sentiment that there might come a disruption of the Democratic party. There had been a few hours before the convention a meeting of the opposing forces, in which the leading men of either branch had participated. These included, among the so-called "sound money" men, Senator Hill, of New York; Senator Vilas, of Wisconsin;

Senator Grey, of Delaware, and Hon. William C. Whitney, the latter being looked upon as the immediate representative of the existing Democratic administration. On the other hand, Governor John P. Altgeld, of Illinois, who controlled the Illinois delegation absolutely and unpledged, arisen suddenly to an extraordinary influence in Democratic council, and looked upon by many as a possible dominating force in the convention, assisted by other silverite Democrats of relative prominence in other states, took an equally vigorous part, with the confidence of having ultimately all the power in their hands. This latest conference resulted in nothing. It separated with an implied declaration of political war to the knife, and with a practical assurance that the Free Silver majority of the convention, in order to assure itself of control of the convention, course would disregard precedent, reject, at least, in part, the nominations of the National Committee for temporary organization, and substitute for the chairman, selected by that committee, a chairman of its own choice. Meanwhile, as a side issue, the Illinois delegation, counted the controlling one in an emergency, had held a meeting, and upon instigation of Governor Altgeld, had decided that an abrogation of the two-thirds rule was justified and necessary. The convention was called to order after the usual manner by the Chairman of the National Committee, who then announced the list of temporary officials, with Senator Hill, of New York, as temporary Chairman. Scarcely had the Chairman of the National Committee submitted the report, when the Hon. H. D. Clayton, of Alabama, stepped upon the platform to submit the minority report of the National Committee. It made no other change

in the list of officials than to substitute for Chairman Senator Daniel, of Vermont, in place of Senator David B. Hill, of New York. Immediately the convention was in an uproar. It was apparent that the Silverites had decided to exert their strength ruthlessly from the beginning.

Hardly had the Chairman made his announcement before a fierce debate began upon the subject. Speeches were made by A. L. McDermott, of Missouri; ex-Governor Thomas H. Waller, of Connecticut; Hon. Charles H. Thomas, of Colorado; Hon. John R. Fellows, of New York, and Hon. Ladd, of Illinois; McDermott, Waller, and Fellows supporting the action of the National Committee, and Thomas Ladd and Clayton opposing it vigorously. As an illustration of the different views advanced, the addresses made by Hon. Charles S. Thomas and Hon. John R. Fellows will perhaps afford the best idea. Said Mr. Thomas:

"Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Democratic National Convention: I shall not detain you long in saying something on behalf of the minority of the democratic national committee, and I would say nothing but for the speech of the distinguished gentleman who has just taken his seat. You are told that the majority of this convention, overriding precedent and disturbing tradition, proposes by revolutionary methods to force upon this convention an unheard-of procedure. I desire to call your attention to the fact that although in the past history of democratic national conventions there have been no minority reports, nevertheless it is a fact that that which the committee does is simply a recommendation to be adopted or rejected as the convention declares itself. And a convention which has the power to adopt, necessarily, if it sees fit to exercise it, has the power to reject.

"We have no desire whatever to extinguish discussion or to suppress debate, but I will say to my friend from Connecticut that when he, in connection with other distinguished easterners, by the papers, through the Associated press, declared that their purpose was to come to this convention and capture it without yielding an inch to any one, we felt that a duty was consequently imposed upon the members of the national committee to carry out, as far as possible, what we concede to be the wish of the assembled

majority of the delegates of the democracy of the union. We knew that the committee, if constituted to represent that sentiment, would have reported in favor of the Hon. John W. Daniel, of Virginia.

"My friend asks what republicans will say of our action. Democrats who have fought in the west as I have for twenty-five years have long ago become indifferent to what republicans say. But we do know that if precedents were necessary they furnished us one by their own action in this magnificent city in 1880, and those who are so fearful of republican public opinion ought to pay some deference to republican precedents.

"My friends I desire to repel the charge that the democrats of the United States desire to inflict indignity and disgrace on the senior senator of New York. Nothing can be further from our intention. I recall that four years ago I stood in the convention as his friend, while his new-found friends declared him to be unworthy of the respect of a democratic convention. I stood here with others asking a hearing for his advocates, which hearing was denied by the very men who say to-day that he should preside over this convention. I say with my whole heart, God bless him. I hope to see him in this campaign with us. If we are to judge his future by his past, his utterances upon the great question which now confronts us warm the hearts of the free-coinage men of the country.

"Now, my fellow citizens, every speaker who has preceded me upon this platform has declared, one of them pointing to the portrait of the immortal Washington which looks down in benediction upon us— Well, Washington is a good name in a democratic convention, anyhow. They are both immortal democratic names. They have said, and they have said truly, that it is a matter for the majority to determine. Now, my fellow citizens, why did we take this action? One word more and I am through. We took this action because we have been told in the public prints of this and other cities, where we have no voice and through which we cannot be heard, where everything that we do seems to be misreported, for the purpose, I presume, of creating improper impressions—we were told that your purpose was to assume control of this convention, if possible, and we made up our minds that if the battle must come, the sooner it came the better, and if, as a matter of fact, we are not acting within the line of democratic precedent, so far as majorities are concerned, then I submit to the calm and deliberate judgment of this convention whether they, and they alone, are not to determine who shall be their presiding officer. I appeal to you, fellow-delegates, to stand by the minority report. Let it not be said that in the first skirmish the pickets which you yourselves threw out were driven back into the lines. I ask you to adopt the minority substitute upon this question."

Hon. John R. Fellows followed, with the subjoined address:

"Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Convention: Ordinarily

it would be a comparatively immaterial question as to which of these two distinguished, capable and deserving democrats occupied the position at this table of temporary chairman during your deliberations. The fact of rejection may be pregnant with a good deal of significance. I recognize here, and my voice fails me in the power of utterance in speaking of the splendid ability and the almost unparalleled elegance of language and devotion to democracy which characterize the senator from Virginia, and had he been named for a position in this convention, or upon our ticket, New York would gladly have responded to the expression and given to him its enthusiastic democratic support. But a great deal more than that is involved in this question to-day. I have yet to hear upon the part of these gentlemen who have addressed you any expression or argument, any logical statement as to why you should trample under foot the inmemorial usages of your party, why you should violate all of its precedents and adopt hitherto unheard-of modes of procedure. What is the reason for it? What is concealed behind it? What purposes undeveloped in the fact itself are to be accomplished by its consummation?

"Is it that you dare not trust the gentleman whom the majority of your national committee has presented for your temporary officer? No, you repel with indignant scorn that imputation. His whole life behind him, exposed to the full glare of the public gaze, always in the light of public observation, repels an insinuation of that character. No right of the majority of this convention would be assailed, no restrictions placed in the way of the completion of the purpose they have in view.

"Now, what is our attitude here to-day? Let us think it over for a moment, at least, before we proceed to this unheard-of, this unnecessary act. The national committee is the only organization existing for four years of interregnum that represents the entire body of the party. When, each four years, your convention assembles it then takes matters in its own hands, so far as the formulation of its policy and the selection of its candidates is concerned. But there is no power authorized to call this body together, and there is no power authorized to ascertain the presence of a convention, save this national committee, and hitherto, for a longer period than is covered by the lives of any of the delegates who sit before me, the national committee has presented—for purposes of organization alone and not with reference to deciding the policy of the party—it has presented officers temporarily to fill the chair. The gentleman from Colorado was unfortunate in his political reminiscence. It would have been better had he left unsaid that which he said, because for the first time in all the history of our democratic party you are going back of its old traditions; you are violating its time-honored usages, and you are accepting a thing that was done for the first time in the history of parties in this republic by a republican convention.

"The gentleman from Colorado told us with powerful force of expression that they of the west who had been fighting the battles of democracy so long had learned to be somewhat indifferent to

the views or wishes of the republican party. And yet you begin the proceedings of this convention by accepting a republican precedent, disowned, denounced, flouted and spit upon by every democratic body of the country. And against whom have you done it? Ah, gentlemen, you will neither question the democracy, the fealty nor the fairness of the gentleman whom the national committee in accordance with precedents has presented here. But go further. Go further, and see what precedent you ask us to establish, and see what the significance of your action is. You tell me this is not a personal affront, this is not a thrust at an individual or a section?

"Now, gentlemen of the majority, for we perfectly well understand that there is a majority of this convention—large, pronounced, honest in conviction and decided in purpose—that stands opposed to some of us from the eastern part of the country, we recognize your right to control. You will go on, whoever is chairman here, and through your appropriate mediums you will formulate and present to the country your policy. It cannot be changed by the selection of a temporary officer. It will not be affected by anything that may be done during the temporary organization. It is the work of the permanent convention after it is ascertained and through its committees. Now, I want to tell you that there is a precedent, and a powerful one, for your accepting here to-day the action of the national committee, although it is not in accord with the majority sentiment of this convention. Four years ago we met here, on the part of New York and some other portions of the country, to oppose the candidacy of the present president of the United States, whom we all knew had an exceedingly large majority of the delegates elected, but whom we did not believe at the time, perhaps, had the requisite two-thirds. But the sentiment of the majority was overwhelmingly in favor of the nomination of Mr. Cleveland, and we all knew it.

"And yet, gentlemen, and yet—think of it for a moment—when in the national committee it was suggested that a person known to be friendly to Mr. Cleveland's nomination and in sympathy with the majority was named for temporary officer it was voted down and Mr. Owens of Kentucky, who was an opponent of Mr. Cleveland's and voted against him in the convention, was selected as the temporary officer, and every member of the convention accepted the action of the committee. Then when the majority came to its own it put in the chair a permanent officer of its choice. It made up its committees in accordance with this sentiment, had its rightful way in the rest of the convention. Gentlemen, don't do this thing. Don't do this thing. It rudely shatters all customs and ancient usages. There is much sentiment that clings around us; there is much that appeals to those who have grown wrinkled and gray in the service of the party, that appeals for perpetuation; we may do all that you ask of us for the sake of the perpetuation of the party, but at least do it along the paths over which the fathers walked and in accordance with the usages that have grown sacred for years.

"I do not know why you should do this thing. The gentleman has told us that for twenty-five years—the eloquent, gentleman from Alabama—that for twenty-five years they have been giving it to New York. Very well. It is true that we have been more than honored and favored beyond our deserts. We are grateful in the name of the common democracy for your generous action, but remember this, and let it ring like the notes of the coronation hymn through your hearts and brains, that although you gave us the candidate New York gave you the only democratic president we have had. Do not strike this blow at our love now. Indiana has been named for a place upon your temporary organization. Indiana has been accepted. Other states have been named by the choice of gentlemen who shall participate in this temporary organization. You consent to accept them, but you turn against him and you strike a big democrat, whom every democrat loves, I believe. You single him out for humiliation and sacrifice, and you present in its name a gentleman we love, revere and honor, and yet he fought four years ago upon the platform of a democratic national convention, and he fought by the utterance of one of the most elegant speeches to which I ever listened, for David B. Hill as the rightful.

"This man seconded the nomination of David B. Hill for the office of president of these United States for four years, who now seems to believe that he is unworthy to occupy that position. Ah, gentlemen, gentlemen. 'Methinks you do protest too much or not at all.' You have gone far enough. If you do not desire to approve of the expression of the national committee then reject all of this report and name other officers, the secretaries, the sergeant-at-arms and other officers who are upon that list. The significance of this is that you abandon all precedent by your action. You select one man out of this entire list upon whom to heap this indignity. I make no threats. I shall regret any such action by this convention. It is not a question of what we will do. We are democrats, desiring to march with our party, to do what we can toward making its perpetuity and its ascendancy successful, but don't humiliate us; don't seek to inflict what seems to be a mark of punishment upon us, and, especially, if you must select a victim to drag to the altar, throwing the creed of your past and custom you have followed away, at least select a victim not so hallowed to the people, not so beloved by the democracy, and not so necessary to its success as the one you have selected to-day.

The action of the convention, after the debate was immediate and arbitrary. A ballot was taken, and the Silverites exhibited a preponderating force in the convention. The name of the Hon. John W. Daniel, of Virginia, was by this vote substituted for that of Hon. David B. Hill, of New York, as designating the temporary chair.

man of the convention. The vote stood: Yeas, 556; Nays, 349.

It was recognized by the forces opposed to the Free Silverites that they were a minority in the convention and a minority which must inevitably be overridden. They began after the session, which ended with little more accomplished, to organize themselves into a definite force, which might or might not vote, but which was opposed to the ideas of the majority.

Senator Hill's speech was followed by one from Senator Vilas, of Wisconsin, who pleaded eloquently in the same cause, but the convention, though interested, was not convinced. Ex-Governor W. E. Russell, of Massachusetts, pleaded uselessly in the same strain. Then followed the Hon. W. J. Bryan, of Nebraska, a prominent leader of the Silverite forces, who at this stage of the convention's progress had already come to be looked upon as a formidable contingency when the vote upon the Presidential nomination should come. He was received with a storm of applause. His address is here given:

CHAPTER XI.

CHICAGO PLATFORM SPEECH.

SPEECH CONCLUDING DEBATE ON THE CHICAGO PLATFORM.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Convention: I would be presumptuous, indeed, to present myself against the distinguished gentlemen to whom you have listened if this were a mere measuring of abilities; but this is not a contest between persons. The humblest citizen in all the land, when clad in the armor of a righteous cause, is stronger than all the hosts of error. I come to speak to you in defense of a cause as holy as the cause of liberty—the cause of humanity.

When this debate is concluded, a motion will be made to lay upon the table the resolution offered in commendation of the administration and also the resolution offered in condemnation of the administration. We object to bringing this question down to the level of persons. The individual is but an atom; he is born, he acts, he dies; but principles are eternal; and this has been a contest over a principle.

Never before in the history of this country has there been witnessed such a contest as that through which we have just passed. Never before in the history of American politics has a great issue been fought out as this issue has been, by the voters of a great party. On the fourth of March, 1895, a few Democrats, most of them members of Congress, issued an address to the Democrats of the nation, asserting that the money question was the paramount issue of the hour; declaring that a majority of the Democratic party had the right to control the action of the party on this paramount issue; and concluding with the request that the believers in the free coinage of silver in the Democratic party should organize, take charge of, and control the policy of the Democratic party. Three months later, at Memphis, an organization was perfected, and the silver Democrats went forth openly and courageously proclaiming their belief, and declaring that, if successful, they would crystallize into a platform the declaration which they had made. Then began the conflict. With a zeal approaching the zeal which inspired the Crusaders who followed Peter the Hermit, our silver Democrats went forth from victory unto victory until they are now assembled, not to discuss, not to debate, but to enter up the judgment already rendered by the plain people of this country. In this contest brother has been arrayed against brother, father against son.

The warmest ties of love, acquaintance, and association have been disregarded, old leaders have been cast aside when they have refused to give expression to the sentiments of those whom they would lead, and new leaders have sprung up to give direction to this cause of truth. Thus has the contest been waged, and we have assembled here under as binding and solemn instructions as were ever imposed upon representatives of the people.

We do not come as individuals. As individuals we might have been glad to compliment the gentleman from New York (Senator Hill), but we know that the people for whom we speak would never be willing to put him in a position where he could thwart the will of the Democratic party. I say it was not a question of persons; it was a question of principle, and it is not with gladness, my friends, that we find ourselves brought into conflict with those who are now arrayed on the other side.

The gentleman who preceded me (ex-Governor Russell) spoke of the State of Massachusetts; let me assure him that not one present in all this convention entertains the least hostility to the people of the State of Massachusetts, but we stand here representing people who are the equals, before the law, of the greatest citizens in the State of Massachusetts. When you (turning to the gold delegates) come before us and tell us that we are about to disturb your business interests, we reply that you have disturbed our business interests by your course.

We say to you that you have made the definition of a business man too limited in its application. The man who is employed for wages is as much a business man as his employer; the attorney in a country town is as much a business man as the corporation counsel in a great metropolis; the merchant at the cross-roads store is as much a business man as the merchant of New York; the farmer who goes forth in the morning and toils all day—who begins in the spring and toils all summer—and who by the application of brain and muscle to the natural resources of the country creates wealth, is as much a business man as the man who goes upon the board of trade and bets upon the price of grain; the miners who go down a thousand feet into the earth, or climb two thousand feet upon the cliffs, and bring forth from their hiding places the precious metals to be poured into the channels of trade are as much business men as the few financial magnates who, in a back room, corner the money of the world. We come to speak for this broader class of business men.

Ah, my friends, we say not one word against those who live upon the Atlantic coast, but the hardy pioneers who have braved all the dangers of the wilderness, who have made the desert to blossom as the rose—the pioneers away out there (pointing to the West), who rear their children near to Nature's heart, where they can mingle their voices with the voices of the birds—out there where they have erected school-

houses for the education of their young, churches where they praise their Creator, and cemeteries where rest the ashes of their dead—these people, we say, are as deserving of the consideration of our party as any people in this country. It is for these that we speak. We do not come as aggressors. Our war is not a war of conquest; we are fighting in the defense of our homes, our families, and posterity. We have petitioned, and our petitions have been scorned; we have entreated, and our entreaties have been disregarded; we have begged, and they have mocked when our calamity came. We beg no longer; we entreat no more; we petition no more. We defy them.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has said that he fears a Robespierre. My friends, in this land of the free you need not fear that a tyrant will spring up from among the people. What we need is an Andrew Jackson to stand, as Jackson stood, against the encroachments of organized wealth.

They tell us that this platform was made to catch votes. We reply to them that changing conditions make new issues; that the principles upon which Democracy rests are as everlasting as the hills, but that they must be applied to new conditions as they arise. Conditions have arisen, and we are here to meet those conditions. They tell us that the income tax ought not to be brought in here; that it is a new idea. They criticize us for our criticism of the Supreme Court of the United States. My friends, we have not criticised; we have simply called attention to what you already know. If you want criticisms, read the dissenting opinions of the court. There you will find criticisms. They say that we passed an unconstitutional law; we deny it. The income tax law was not unconstitutional when it was passed; it was not unconstitutional when it went before the Supreme Court for the first time; it did not become unconstitutional until one of the judges changed his mind, and we cannot be expected to know when a judge will change his mind. The income tax is just. It simply intends to put the burdens of government justly upon the backs of the people. I am in favor of an income tax. When I find a man who is not willing to bear his share of the burdens of the government which protects him, I find a man who is unworthy to enjoy the blessings of a government like ours.

They say that we are opposing national bank currency; it is true. If you will read what Thomas Benton said, you will find he said that, in searching history, he could find but one parallel to Andrew Jackson; that was Cicero, who destroyed the conspiracy of Cataline and saved Rome. Benton said that Cicero only did for Rome what Jackson did for us when he destroyed the bank conspiracy and saved America. We say in our platform that we believe that the right to coin and issue money is a function of government. We believe it. We believe that it is a part of sovereignty, and can no more with safety be delegated to private individuals than we could afford

to delegate to private individuals the power to make penal statutes or levy taxes. Mr. Jefferson, who was once regarded as good Democratic authority, seems to have differed in opinion from the gentleman who has addressed us on the part of the minority. Those who are opposed to this proposition tell us that the issue of paper money is a function of the bank, and that the Government ought to go out of the banking business. I stand with Jefferson rather than with them, and tell them, as he did, that the issue of money is a function of government, and that the banks ought to go out of the governing business.

They complain about the plank which declares against life tenure in office. They have tried to strain it to mean that which it does not mean. What we oppose by that plank is the life tenure which is being built up in Washington, and which excludes from participation in official benefits the humbler members of society.

Let me call your attention to two or three important things. The gentleman from New York says that he will propose an amendment to the platform providing that the proposed change in our monetary system shall not affect contracts already made. Let me remind you that there is no intention of affecting those contracts which according to present laws are made payable in gold; but if he means to say that we cannot change our monetary system without protecting those who have loaned money before the change was made, I desire to ask him where, in law or in morals, he can find justification for not protecting the debtors when the act of 1873 was passed, if he now insists that we must protect the creditors.

He says he will also propose an amendment which will provide for the suspension of free coinage if we fail to maintain the parity within a year. We reply that when we advocate a policy which we believe will be successful, we are not compelled to raise a doubt as to our own sincerity by suggesting what we shall do if we fail. I ask him, if he would apply his logic to us, why he does not apply it to himself. He says he wants this country to try to secure an international agreement. Why does he not tell us what he is going to do if he fails to secure an international agreement? There is more reason for him to do that than there is for us to provide against the failure to maintain the parity. Our opponents have tried for twenty years to secure an international agreement, and those are waiting for it most patiently who do not want it at all.

And now, my friends, let me come to the paramount issue. If they ask us why it is that we say more on the money question than we say upon the tariff question, I reply that, if protection has slain its thousands, the gold standard has slain its tens of thousands. If they ask us why we do not embody in our platform all the things that we believe in, we reply that when we have restored the money of the Constitution all other necessary reforms will be possible; but that until this is done there is no other reform that can be accomplished.

Why is it that within three months such a change has come over the country? Three months ago, when it was confidently asserted that those who believe in the gold standard would frame our platform and nominate our candidates, even the advocates of the gold standard did not think that we could elect a president. And they had good reason for their doubt, because there is scarcely a State here to-day asking for the gold standard which is not in the absolute control of the Republican party. But note the change. Mr. McKinley was nominated at St. Louis upon a platform which declared for the maintenance of the gold standard until it can be changed into bimetallism by international agreement. Mr. McKinley was the most popular man among the Republicans, and three months ago everybody in the Republican party prophesied his election. How is it to-day? Why, the man who was once pleased to think that he looked like Napoleon—that man shudders to-day when he remembers that he was nominated on the anniversary of the battle of Waterloo. Not only that, but as he listens he can hear with ever-increasing distinctness the sound of the waves as they beat upon the lonely shores of St. Helena.

Why this change? Ah, my friends, is not the reason for the change evident to any one who will look at the matter? No private character, however pure, no personal popularity, however great, can protect from the avenging wrath of an indignant people a man who will declare that he is in favor of fastening the gold standard upon this country, or who is willing to surrender the right of self-government and place the legislative control of our affairs in the hands of foreign potentates and powers.

We go forth confident that we shall win. Why? Because upon the paramount issue of this campaign there is not a spot of ground upon which the enemy will dare to challenge battle. If they tell us that the gold standard is a good thing, we shall point to their platform and tell them that their platform pledges the party to get rid of the gold standard and substitute bimetallism. If the gold standard is a good thing, why try to get rid of it? I call your attention to the fact that some of the very people who are in this convention to-day and who tell us that we ought to declare in favor of international bimetallism—thereby declaring that the gold standard is wrong and that the principle of bimetallism is better—these very people four months ago were open and avowed advocates of the gold standard, and were then telling us that we could not legislate two metals together, even with the aid of all the world. If the gold standard is a good thing, we ought to declare in favor of its retention and not in favor of abandoning it; and if the gold standard is a bad thing why should we wait until other nations are willing to help us to let go? Here is the line of battle, and we care not upon which issue they force the fight; we are prepared to meet them on either issue or on both. If they tell us that the gold standard is the standard of civiliza-

tion, we reply to them that this, the most enlightened of all the nations of the earth, has never declared for a gold standard, and that both the great parties this year are declaring against it. If the gold standard is the standard of civilization, why, my friends, should we not have it? If they come to meet us on that issue we can present the history of our nation. More than that; we can tell them that they will search the pages of history in vain to find a single instance where the common people of any land have ever declared in favor of the gold standard. They can find where the holders of fixed investments have declared for a gold standard, but not where the masses have.

Mr. Carlisle said in 1878 that this was a struggle between "the idle holders of idle capital" and "the struggling masses, who produce the wealth and pay the taxes of the country;" and, my friends, the question we are to decide is: Upon which side will the Democratic party fight; upon the side of "the idle holders of idle capital" or upon the side of "the struggling masses?" That is the question which the party must answer first, and then it must be answered by each individual hereafter. The sympathies of the Democratic party, as shown by the platform, are on the side of the struggling masses who have ever been the foundation of the Democratic party. There are two ideas of government. There are those who believe that, if you will only legislate to make the well-to-do prosperous, their prosperity will leak through on those below. The Democratic idea, however, has been that if you legislate to make the masses prosperous, their prosperity will find its way up through every class which rests upon them.

You come to us and tell us that the great cities are in favor of the gold standard; we reply that the great cities rest upon our broad and fertile prairies. Burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country.

My friends, we declare that this nation is able to legislate for its own people on every question, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation on earth; and upon that issue we expect to carry every State in the Union. I shall not slander the inhabitants of the fair State of Massachusetts nor the inhabitants of the State of New York by saying that, when they are confronted with the proposition, they will declare that this nation is not able to attend to its own business. It is the issue of 1776 over again. Our ancestors, when but three millions in number, had the courage to declare their political independence of every other nation; shall we, their descendants, when we have grown to seventy millions, declare that we are less independent than our forefathers? No, my friends, that will never be the verdict of our people. Therefore, we care not upon what lines the battle is fought. If they say bimetallism is good, but that we cannot have it until other nations help us, we reply that, instead of having a

gold standard because England has, we will restore bimetal-
lism, and then let England have bimetalism because the
United States has it. If they dare to come out in the open
field and defend the gold standard as a good thing, we will
fight them to the uttermost. Having behind us the producing
masses of this nation and the world, supported by the com-
mercial interests, the laboring interests, and the toilers every-
where, we will answer their demand for a gold standard by
saying to them: You shall not press down upon the brow of
labor this crown of thorns, you shall not crucify mankind upon
a cross of gold.

CHAPTER XII.

CONTINUATION OF THE STRUGGLE.

The majority of the Democratic National Committee had, as the event proved, represented the ideas of but a minority of the delegates elected to the convention. Their preliminary dictum had been overruled and Senator Daniels took the chair.

The Committee on Credentials, necessarily extremely Free Silverite, had considered the case of the contesting delegates of Nebraska and Michigan and had decided in their favor. The convention confirmed the action of the committee. In Nebraska the issue had been somewhat doubtful and was settled easily and readily, From Michigan had come a properly certified delegation and here the case promised to be more difficult. In Michigan the Silverites thought they had a majority in the Democratic State Convention. The convention went the other way and the claim was advanced that delegates had been tampered with and that the balance was on the other side, and that federal patronage had defeated the real will of the people.

The Silver men asked the National Convention to reverse the instructions of the State Convention on the ground that they were in violation of public sentiment and accept what it ought to have done instead of what it did. The Credentials Committee responded by throwing

out enough of those opposed to them in the Michigan delegation to insure a majority, after which the delegation enforced the unite rule, thus making it solid for Free Silver. The Nebraska delegation of minor importance had shared the same fate at an earlier hour. The result of this was to give to the Free Silverites a possible two-thirds majority without resorting to the device of abolishing the time honored custom of the Democracy.

The next struggle between the two factions must necessarily be over the platform, which was to enunciate the principles of which every wing of the party should prove dominant. It was of course apparent that this dominated force would be the Silver wing, but there was still maintained a resolute but desperate struggle by those who had been denominated the Sound Money men. Each wing had prominent representatives in the Committee on Platform, and the struggle there was resolute and long continued. It resulted in an absolute difference of opinion, the Silverites having a majority, and the eventual bringing before the convention of a majority and minority report, affording scope for another debate and for a more clearly defined expression of the difference of opinion between the contending wings of the party. The Silverite report, that of the majority, was as follows:

"We, the Democrats of the United States, in national convention assembled, do reaffirm our allegiance to those great essential principles of justice and liberty upon which our institutions are founded and which the Democratic party has advocated from Jefferson's time to our own—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of conscience, the preservation of personal rights, the equality of all citizens before the law, and the faithful observance of constitutional limitations.

"During all these years the Democratic party has resisted the tendency of selfish interests to the centralization of governmental power and steadfastly maintained the integrity of the dual scheme of government established by the founders of this republic of re-

publics. Under its guidance and teachings the great principle of local self-government has found its best expression in the maintenance of the rights of the States and in its assertion of the necessity of confiding the general government to the exercise of the powers granted by the Constitution of the United States.

"Recognizing that the money system is paramount to all others at this time, we invite attention to the fact that the Federal Constitution names silver and gold together as the money metals of the United States, and that the first coinage law passed by Congress under the Constitution made the silver dollar the monetary unit and admitted gold to free coinage at a ratio based upon the silver dollar unit.

"We declare that the act of 1873, demonetizing silver without the knowledge or approval of the American people, has resulted in the appreciation of gold and a corresponding fall in the prices of commodities produced by the people; a heavy increase in the burden of taxation and of all debts, public and private; the enrichment of the money lending class at home and abroad; prostration of industry and impoverishment of the people.

"We are unalterably opposed to monometallism, which has locked fast the prosperity of an industrial people in the paralysis of hard times. Gold monometallism is a British policy, and its adoption has brought other nations into financial servitude to London. It is not only un-American, but anti-American, and it can be fastened on the United States only by the stifling of that spirit and love of liberty which proclaimed our political independence in 1776 and won it in the war of the revolution.

"We demand the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1 without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation. We demand that the standard silver dollar shall be full legal tender, equally with gold, for all debts, public and private, and we favor such legislation as will prevent for the future the demonetization of any kind of legal tender money by private contract.

"We are opposed to the policy and practice of surrendering to the holders of the obligations of the United States the option reserved by the law to the government of redeeming such obligations in either silver coin or gold coin.

"We are opposed to the issuing of interest-bearing bonds of the United States in times of peace, and condemn the trafficking with banking syndicates which, in exchange for bonds and at an enormous profit to themselves, supply the Federal Treasury with gold to maintain the policy of gold monometallism.

"Congress alone has the power to coin and issue money, and President Jackson declared that this power could not be delegated to corporations or individuals. We, therefore, demand that the power to issue notes to circulate as money be taken from the national banks and that all paper money shall be issued directly by the Treasury Department, and be redeemable in coin and receivable for all debts, public and private.

"We hold that tariff duties should be levied for purposes of

revenue, such duties to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the country and not discriminate between class or section, and that taxation should be limited by the needs of the government honestly and economically administered. We denounce as disturbing to business the Republican threat to restore the McKinley law, which has been twice condemned by the people in national elections, and which, enacted under the false plea of protection to home industry, proved a prolific breeder of trusts and monopolies, enriched the few at the expense of the many, restricted trade and deprived the producers of the great American staples of access to their natural markets.

"Until the money question is settled we are opposed to any agitation for further changes in our tariff laws, except such as are necessary to make good the deficit in revenue caused by the adverse decision of the Supreme Court on the income tax. But for this decision by the Supreme Court there would be no deficit in the revenue under the law passed by a Democratic Congress in strict pursuance of the uniform decisions of that court for nearly 100 years—that court having under that decision sustained constitutional objections to its enactment, which had been overruled by the ablest Judges who have ever sat on that bench. We declare that it is the duty of Congress to use all the constitutional power which remains after that decision, or which may come from its reversal of the court as it may hereafter be constituted, so that the burdens of taxation may be equally and impartially laid to the end that wealth may bear its due proportion of the expenses of the government.

"We hold that the most efficient way of protecting American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market, and that the value of the home market to our American farmers and artisans is greatly reduced by a vicious monetary system which depresses the prices of their products below the cost of production and thus deprives them of the means of purchasing the products of our home manufacturing factories.

"The absorption of wealth by the few, the consolidation of our leading railway systems, and the formation of trusts and pools require a stricter control by the Federal Government of those arteries of commerce. We demand the enlargement of the powers of the Inter-State Commerce Commission, and such restrictions and guarantees in the control of railroads as will protect the people from robbery and oppression.

"We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation, and the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses which have kept taxes high, while the labor that pays them is unemployed and the products of the people's toil are depressed till they no longer repay the cost of production. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government, and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

"We denounce arbitrary interference by Federal authorities in local affairs as a violation of the Constitution of the United States and a crime against free institutions, and we especially object to government by injunction as a new and highly dangerous form of oppression by which Federal Judges, in contempt of the laws of the States and rights of citizens, become at once legislators, Judges, and executioners; and we approve the bill passed at the last session of the United States Senate and now pending in the House, relative to contempts in Federal courts and providing for trials by jury in certain cases of contempt.

"No discrimination should be indulged in by the Government of the United States in favor of any of its debtors. We approve of the refusal of the Fifty-third Congress to pass the Pacific railroad funding bill and denounce the effort of the present Republican Congress to enact a similar measure.

"Recognizing the just claims of deserving Union soldiers, we heartily indorse the rule of Commissioner Murphy that no names shall be arbitrarily dropped from the pension roll, and the fact of enlistment and service should be deemed conclusive evidence against disease and disability before enlistment.

"We favor the admission of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona into the Union as States, and we favor the early admission of all the Territories having the necessary population and resources to entitle them to Statehood, and while they remain Territories we hold that the officials appointed to administer the government of any Territory, together with the District of Columbia and Alaska, should be bona fide residents of the territory of the district in which their duties are to be performed. The Democratic party believes in home rule and that all public lands of the United States should be appropriated to the establishment of free homes for American citizens.

"We recommend that the Territory of Alaska be granted a delegate in Congress and that the general land and timber laws of the United States be extended to said Territory.

"We extend our sympathy to the people of Cuba in their heroic struggle for liberty and independence.

"We are opposed to life tenure in the public service. We favor appointments based upon merits, fixed terms of office, and such an administration of the civil service laws as will afford equal opportunities to all citizens of ascertained fitness.

"We declare it to be the unwritten law of this republic, established by custom and usage of 100 years, and sanctioned by the examples of the greatest and wisest of those who founded and have maintained our government, that no man shall be eligible for a third term of the Presidential office.

"The Federal Government should care for and improve the Mississippi River and other great waterways of the republic so as to secure for the interior States easy and cheap transportation to tidewater. When any waterway of the republic is of sufficient importance to demand aid of the government, such aid should be

extended upon a definite plan of continuous work, until permanent improvement is secured.

"Confiding in the justice of our cause and the necessity of its success at the polls, we submit the foregoing declaration of principles and purposes to the considerate judgment of the American people. We invite the support of all citizens who approve them and who desire to have them made effective through legislation for the relief of the people, and the restoration of the country's prosperity."

The presentation of this report of the majority was followed by the report of the minority, which was as follows:

"Sixteen delegates, constituting the minority of the committee on resolutions, find many declarations in the report of the majority to which they cannot give their assent. Some of those are wholly unnecessary. Some are ill-considered and ambiguously phrased, while others are extreme and revolutionary of the well-recognized principles of the parties. The minority content themselves with this general expression of dissent, without going into a specific statement of the objectionable features of the report of the majority, but upon the financial question, which engages the chief share of public attention, the views of the majority differs so fundamentally from what the minority regards as vital to democratic doctrine as to demand a distinct statement of what they hold as the only just and true expression of democratic faith upon this prominent issue, as follows, which is offered as a substitute for the financial plank in the majority report:

"We declare our belief that the experiment on the part of the United States alone of free silver coinage, and a change of the existing standard of value independently of the action of other great nations would not only impair our finances but would retard or entirely prevent the establishment of international bimetallism to which the efforts of the government should be steadily directed. It would place this country at once upon a silver basis, impair contracts, disturb business, diminish the purchasing power of the wages of labor and inflict irreparable evils upon our nation's commerce and industry.

"Until international co-operation among leading nations for the coinage of silver can be secured, we favor the rigid maintenance of the existing gold standard as essential to the preservation of our national credit, the redemption of our public debt, and the keeping inviolate of our country's honor. We insist that all our paper and silver currency shall be kept absolutely at a parity with gold. The democratic party is a party of hard money, and is opposed to legal-tender paper money as a part of our permanent financial system, and we, therefore, favor the gradual retirement of all United States notes and treasury notes under such legislative provisions as will prevent undue contraction.

"We demand that the national credit shall be resolutely maintained at all time and under all circumstances.

"The minority also feels that the report of the majority is defective in failing to make any recognition of the honesty, economy, courage and fidelity of the present democratic administration. And they therefore offer the following declaration as an amendment to the minority report:

"We commend the honesty, economy, courage and fidelity of the present democratic administration."

Mr. Hill, of New York, offered the following amendment also:

"But it should be carefully provided by law at the same time that any change in the monetary standard of New York should not apply to existing contracts.

"Our advocacy of the independent free coinage of silver being based on the belief that such coinage will be to effect and maintain the parity between gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 be declared as a pledge of our sincerity that if such free coinage should fail to effect such parity within one year from its enactment by law, such coinage shall thereupon be suspended."

CHAPTER XIII.

THE ISSUE DEFINED.

The presentation of the majority report was followed by the appearance of Senator Tillman, of South Carolina, on the platform, who declared the issues to be sectional, and who asserted that the existing administration should be repudiated. He offered a resolution to that effect. He was followed by Senator Jones, of Arkansas; who denied the assertions made, and who stated that the issue was not sectional in any sense. Then followed a great debate upon the platform. It was well understood that the most prominent advocates of the opposing forces would be Senator David B. Hill, of New York, and Hon. William J. Bryan, of Nebraska. The appearance of Sen. Hill resulted in an ovation of applause from the audience. He spoke as follows:

"I do not know that it is necessary that I should reply to the distinguished senator from South Carolina. And I trust that in any reply I may make I shall not fail to accord to him my profound respects.

"I would say at the outset, I am a democrat, but I am not a revolutionist. I will say, further, that no matter what the provocation, you cannot drive me out of the democratic party. Without intending to specially reply to the remarks of the distinguished senator from South Carolina, I will only say that it was a waste of time upon his part to assume that we were so ignorant as not to know that it was his state that attempted to break up the democratic party in 1860. But that party has survived the attempt of every section of the country to divide it, to distract it: it lives

today, and I hope it will long survive. My mission here today is to unite, not to divide; to build up, not to destroy; to plan for victory and not to plot for defeat. I know that I speak to a convention which, as now constituted, probably does not agree with the views of the state that I especially represent upon this occasion. But I know that, notwithstanding the attack which has been made upon that state, you will hear me for my cause.

"New York makes no apology to South Carolina for her resolution. We get our democracy from our fathers. We do not need to learn it from those whom my friend represents. Need I defend New York? No! it is not necessary. She defends herself. Need I defend the attack made upon her and her citizens of wealth, men of intelligence and character? No, it is not necessary. Need I remind this democratic national convention that it is in the great state of New York and in its great city where the wealth that he inveighs against is situated? But it is in the great city that never but once in its history gave a republican majority. When other cities failed to respond, New York was the Gibraltar of democracy.

"The question which this convention is to decide is which is the best position to take at this time upon the financial question. In a word, the question presented is between international bimetallism and local bimetallism. If there be gold monometallists they are not represented either in the majority report or in the minority report. I therefore start out with this proposition: That the democratic party stands today in favor of gold and silver as the money of the country, but we differ as to the means to bring about that result. Those I represent and for whom I speak—the sixteen members of the minority committee—insist that we should not attempt the experiment of free and unlimited coinage of silver without the co-operation of other great nations. It is not a question of patriotism. It is not a question of courage. It is not a question of loyalty. It is not a question of valor. The majority platform speaks of the subject as though it was simply a question as to whether we were a brave enough people to enter upon this experiment. It is a question of business. It is a question of finance. It is a question of economics. It is not a question notwithstanding, which men ever so brave can solve.

"Mr. President, I think that the safest, the best course for this convention to have pursued was to take the first step forward in the great cause of monetary reform by declaring in favor of international bimetallism. I am not here to assail the honesty or sincerity of a single man who disagrees with me. There are those around me who know that in every utterance made upon this subject I have treated the friends of free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 with respect. I am here to pursue that course today. I do not think that we can safely ignore the monetary systems of other great nations. It is a question about which honest men may differ. I believe we cannot ignore the attitude of other nations upon this subject any more than we can their attitude upon the other questions of the day. I know, it is said, by enthusiastic

friends that America can mark out a course for herself. I know that it appeals to the pride of the average American to say that it matters not what other countries may do, we can arrange this matter for ourselves. But I beg to remind you, if that suggestion is carried out to its legitimate conclusion, you might as well do away with international treaties, you might as well do away with commercial treaties with other countries, you might as well do away with all the provisions in your tariff bills that have relation to the laws of other countries. In this great age, when we are connected with all portions of the earth by our ships, by our cables and by all methods of intercourse, we think that it is unwise to attempt this alone. Mr. President, I want to call your attention to this single point. I think it is unwise further for this convention to hazard this contest upon a single ratio.

"What does this silver platform provide? It should have contented itself with the single statement that it was in favor of the remonetization of silver and the placing it upon equality with gold, but instead of that your committee has recommended for adoption a platform which make the test of democratic loyalty to hang upon a single ratio, and that 16 to 1. I doubt the wisdom of having entered into detail. I doubt the propriety of saying that 15½ or 17 is hereby and 16 is the only true democratic doctrine. Permit me to remind you—I see distinguished senators before me, who in the senate of the United States, friends of free silver, who have introduced bills for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 20 to 1. I beg to remind this convention that some of your candidates propose for nomination men whom I accept and whose democracy is admitted, who have voted time and time again in congress for other ratios than 16 to 1; and yet you are proposing to nominate gold men upon a platform that limits and restricts them to one single ratio.

"With all due respect I think it an unwise step; I think it an unnecessary step, and I think it will return to plague us in the future. I think we have too many close business relations with the other great nations of the world for us to ignore their attitude. Your proposed platform says that the policy of gold monometallism is a British policy. Mr. President, they forget to tell the people of this country that it is a French policy also; they forget to tell the people of this country that it is a German policy also; they fail to remind you that it is a Spanish policy also; they fail to tell you that it is the policy of the whole number of governments represented in what was called the Latin union. Therefore, I think—I think it looks a little—just a trifle like demagoguery to suggest that this is the policy of the single nation alone.

"Mr. President: I regret also to see that your platform reads not any single word in favor of international bimetalism; not necessarily inconsistent with this platform, and there is no declaration whatever that it is the policy of this government to attempt to bring it about. The minority platform declares expressly that it is the policy of this government to make steady efforts to bring this about. It would be safer to do it; it would be wiser to do it.



Wm. V. Allen



A. A. Bacon

We run no risk upon the great question of the finances of this republic. I do not intend in the brief time allotted to me to enter into any elaborate argument upon this question. I assume that this convention desires, as the people of this country desire, that every silver dollar coined shall be the equal of every other dollar coined.

"I find no words in this platform in favor of the maintenance of the parity of the two metals. I find no suggestion of what is to be done in case the experiment fails. I find no suggestion of how you are to brace up this now depreciated currency. Everything is risked upon the mere fact that it shall be given free coinage at the mints. I beg to call your attention to this fact, that in my humble opinion the very policy condemned by this platform is the policy that has kept your greenback currency and your silver dollar at a parity with gold during the past years. We think that times and conditions have changed. We think that you cannot ignore the fact of the great production of silver in this country. We think you cannot safely ignore the fact, in the preparation of a financial system, that the cost of the production of silver has greatly fallen.

"Why, it is the very pregnant fact that confronts all the world in the solving of this great question, of the immense discovery of silver everywhere. The great fact confronts the world that the cost of silver production has been nearly reduced one-half. If the American people were brave, were courageous, if they had the spirit of 1776, as this platform says, could they, singly and alone, make copper the equal of gold? Could they make lead the equal of gold? Must you not take into consideration the great fact of production, the great fact of the lessening of the cost of production in the last fifteen and twenty years? If bravery, if courage, could produce these results then you could make any metal, no matter what it might be, a money metal. But I tell you, it is a question of economics, a question of business judgment; it is not a question of finance. It is a question of business resources. And upon that it is the judgment of the minority of the committee that the safest course is to take the first great step in favor of international bimetalism and stop there.

"I know it will be said that in some particulars this platform agrees with our republican friends. It, to me, is neither any better nor any worse for it. I call your attention to the fact that your plank upon pensions, that your plank upon the Monroe doctrine, that your plank upon Cuba, that your plank upon territories, that your plank upon Alaska, that your plank even upon civil service are exactly like the republican planks. Therefore I do not think that that criticism will detract from the value of the suggestion.

"Mr. President, I said a few moments ago I thought the safest course for this convention to have pursued was simply to have said that this government should enact a statute in favor of placing gold and silver alike as the currency of the country, and stop there. I do not think, as I said and will repeat it, it is wise to hazard everything upon a single number. Let me go further. I

object to the various provisions of this platform, and I think if the wise, level, cool-headed men, far-sighted men, such as is the distinguished senator from Arkansas who addressed you, had prevailed, that platform would have been different. What was the necessity for opening up the question of greenback circulation? What was the necessity for putting in this platform an implied pledge that this government might issue greenbacks and make them legal tender?

"The democratic party is opposed to paper money. The democratic party from its earliest history has been in favor of hard money. The democratic party thinks that the best way for us to do is to eliminate United States notes and treasury notes from your currency. They are a drag upon your money metals. You have to constantly keep supplied a fund for their redemption, unless you propose to repudiate them. Therefore, when my friend from South Carolina and my friend from Arkansas say that this platform says what it means and means what it says, I would like to have some one who follows me tell what this platform means upon the subject of the issue of paper money hereafter. I am not violating, I think, the secrets of the committee-room when I say that it was avowed that this government might desire to pursue that course, and this is an attempt at this late day to commit the democratic party to the suicidal policy of the issuing of paper money. You say you wanted a clear and distinct platform. You have not got it upon that question. It cannot be defended successfully.

"Another suggestion permit me to make. What was the necessity for putting into the platform other questions which have never been made the tests of democratic loyalty before? Why we find the disputed question of the policy and constitutionality of an income tax. What! Has it come to this, that the followers of Samuel J. Tilden, who, during all his life was the opponent of that iniquitous scheme, which was used against him in his old age to annoy and harass him and humiliate him—why, I say, should it be left to this convention to make as a tenet of democratic faith belief in the propriety and constitutionality of an income law? Why was it wise to assail the supreme court of your country? Will some one tell me what that clause means in this platform? If you meant what you said and said what you meant, will some one explain that provision? That provision, if it means anything, means that it is the duty of congress to reconstruct the supreme court of the country. It means, and it was openly avowed, it means the adding of additional members to it, or the turning out of office and reconstructing the whole court. I said I will not follow any such revolutionary step as that. Whenever before in the history of this country has devotion to an income tax been made the test of democratic loyalty? Never. Have you not undertaken enough, my good friends, now, without seeking to put in this platform these unnecessary, foolish and ridiculous things?

"What further have you done? In this platform you have declared for the first time in the history of this country, that you are

opposed to any life tenure whatever for office. Our fathers before us, our democratic fathers, whom we revere, in the establishment of this government, gave our court judges a life tenure of office. What necessity was there for reviving this question? How foolish and how unnecessary, in my opinion. Our democrats, whose whole lives have been devoted to the service of the party, men whose hopes, whose ambitions, whose aspirations, all lie within party lines, are to be driven out of the party upon this new question of life tenure for the court judges of our federal court. This is a revolutionary step, this is an unwise step, this is an unprecedented step in our party history."

"Another question that I think should have been avoided, and that is this: What was the necessity, what the propriety of taking up the vexed question of the issue of bonds for the preservation of the credit of the nation? Why not have left this financial question of the free coinage of silver alone? What have you declared? You have announced the policy that under no circumstances shall there ever be a single bond issued in times of peace. You have not expected anything. What does this mean? It means the virtual repeal of your resumption act; it means repudiation per se and simple.

The statement is too broad, the statement is too sweeping; it has not been carefully considered. You even oppose congress doing it; you even oppose the president doing it; you oppose them doing it either singly or unitedly; you stand upon the broad proposition that for no purpose, whether to protect the currency or not—whether to preserve your national credit or for any other purpose—shall there be a bond issued. Why, how surprising that would be to my democratic associates in the senate who for the last two or three years have introduced bill after bill for the issuing of bonds for the Nicaragua Canal and other purposes.

"No, no, my friends, this platform has not been wisely considered. In your zeal for monetary reform you have gone out of the true path; you have turned from the true course, and in your anxiety to build up the silver currency you have unnecessarily put in this platform provisions which cannot stand a fair discussion. Let me tell you, my friends, without going into a discussion of the bond question proper, which is somewhat foreign to this subject—let me tell you what would be the condition of this country today if the President of the United States, in the discharge of the public duty that is conferred upon him, had not seen fit to issue bonds to protect the credit of the government. The democratic party has passed a tariff bill which, unfortunately, has not produced a sufficient revenue to meet the necessities of the government. There has been a deficit of about fifty millions a year. It is hoped that in the near future this bill will produce ample revenues for the support of the government, but in the meantime your greenback currency and your treasury notes must be redeemed when they are presented, if you would preserve the honor and the credit of the nation. Where would the money have come from if your President and your southern secretary of the treasury had not

discharged their duty by the issuing of bonds to save the credit of the country?

"Let me call your attention to the figures. There has been issued during this administration \$262,000,000 of bonds. What amount of money have you in the treasury today? Only just about that sum. Where would you have obtained the means with which to redeem your paper money if it had not been produced by the sale of bonds? Why, my friend Tillman could not have had money enough out of the treasury from his salary to pay his expenses home.

"Mr. President, I reiterate to this convention that this has brought into this canvass an unnecessary, a foolish issue, which puts us on the defense in every school district in the state.

"I do not propose to detain you by any other criticism of this platform at this time. It is sufficient that you have entered upon an issue on which the democracy is largely divided. In addition to that you have unwisely brought into this platform other questions foreign to the main question, and made the support of them the test of democracy. I do not think that this was the course that should have been pursued. Mr. President, there is time enough yet to retrace these false steps. The burdens you have imposed upon us in the eastern states in the support of this platform in its question relating to silver is all that can be reasonably borne. But in addition to that you have put upon us the question of the preservation of the public credit. You have brought into it the question of the issuing of bonds. You have brought into it the question of the reconstruction of the supreme court. You have brought into it the question of the issuing of paper money. You have brought into it the great question of life tenure in office. And this platform is full of incongruous and absurd provisions which are proposed to be made the test of true democracy.

"Mr. President, it is not for me to revive any question of sectionalism, and I shall not do it. This country is now at peace, all sections of it, and let it so remain. I care not from what section of the country the democrat comes, so long as he is true to the fundamental principles of our fathers. I will take him by the hand and express my friendly sentiments toward him. The question of sectionalism will creep in in spite of the efforts of our best men to keep it out. I oppose this platform because I think it makes our success more difficult. I want the grand old party with which I have been associated from my boyhood to be—I have looked forward to the day when it should be securely intrenched in the affections of the American people. I dislike the republican party. I dislike all their tenets. I have no sympathy with their general principles; but I do think that we are here today making a mistake in the venture which we are about to take. Be not deceived. Do not attempt to drive old democrats out of the party that have grown gray in its service, to make room for a lot of republicans and old whigs and other populists that will not vote your ticket after all.

“Do not attempt to trade off the vote of little New Jersey, that never failed to give its electoral vote, and take the experiment of some state out west that has always given its vote to the republican ticket. I tell you that no matter who your candidate may be in this convention, with possibly one exception, your populist friends, upon whom you are relying for support in the west and south, will nominate their own ticket, and your silver forces will be divided. Mark the prediction which I make.

“Some one says ‘No.’ Who are authorized to speak for the populist party here in a democratic convention? I saw upon this platform the other day an array of them, giving countenance and support to this movement, men who never voted a democratic ticket in their lives, and never expect to. They have organized this party. They are the men who attempted to proscribe democrats all over this union. They are the men who were crying against us in the days that tried men’s souls—during the war.

“My friends, I thus speak more in sorrow than in anger. You know what this platform means to the east. You must realize the result. But, calamitous as it may be to us, it will be more calamitous to you if, after all, taking these risks, you do not win this fight. My friends, we want the democratic party to succeed. We want to build it up. We do not want to tear it down. We want our principles—the good old principles of Jefferson, Jackson, of Tilden, of hard money, of safe money. We want no greenback currency on our plates. We want no paper currency whatever. We want to stand by the principles under which we have won during the history of this country, and made it what it is. If we keep in the good old paths of the party, we can win. If we depart from them we shall lose.”

CHAPTER XIV.

THE PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION.

There occurred the most exciting moments of the convention after Mr. Bryan had concluded his speech. The delegates were impressed by his manner and the tide in his favor was augmented. The voting upon the majority and minority reports on the platform began and, while the existing administration was not censured, it was not endorsed, though resolutions had been offered to both effects. The immediate result was the adoption in its entirety of the platform. The main issue up to this time in the history of the convention was now practically decided. The real struggle between the candidates had begun.

It was evident from the time of the wild demonstration at the conclusion of Bryan's speech that the complexion of affairs had changed and that a new and formidable candidate was fairly in the field: No sooner had the convention adjourned than active work began on the part of his friends, and the fact soon became generally recognized that the contest laid practically between him and Bland. At the subsequent short session when the nominating speeches were made he was placed formally in the field.

Balloting began immediately upon the assembling of

the convention at ten o'clock in the morning of July 10th. The Bryan boom had survived the night, and it redoubled its force with the opening of the convention. Every candidate except the Nebraska man had lost strength.

Permanent Chairman White, of California, called the convention to order, and not long thereafter gave way to Congressman Richardson. W. F. Harrity presented Robert E. Pattison, of Pennsylvania, and the chairman of the Oregon delegation nominated Sylvester Pennoyer. Then the roll call began. Alabama voted twenty-two for Boies without attracting much attention, and the call proceeded without discussion until Michigan was reached, when Stevenson, Don Dickinson's partner, who led the fight for gold in that state, challenged the announcement of five for Bland, seven for Bryan and four for Boies. The roll of the state was called, and he declined to vote. So did nine others. The vote was finally announced as first read.

At the call for New Jersey Allen McDermott, the chairman of the delegation, announced that the state would not vote. A man in the Indiana delegation rose and shouted: "Those fellows are republicans and ought to be turned out." Ex-Governor Flower's announcement that New York would not vote was hissed, and cries of "Throw them out!" arose from the galleries.

The first difficulty of the ballot occurred when Wisconsin was reached. General Bragg, chairman of the delegation, announced that Wisconsin would not vote. This announcement called forth a protest from certain silver members of the delegation. General Bragg insisted that Wisconsin was under the unit rule, and that he had correctly reported the sentiments of the delega-

tion. The silver delegates demanded a call of the state. It showed five men voting. The more radical silver men were for declaring that under the unit rule these five could swing the entire vote of the state. The chairman effected a compromise by deciding that the five votes only should be recorded. Colorado voted for Teller. The vote stood: Bland, 223; Bryan, 135; Boies, 86; McLean, 54; Blackburn, 83; Matthews, 37; Pattison, 95; Tillman, 17; Pennoyer, 10; Teller, 8; Stevenson, 2; Campbell, 2; Russell, 2; Hill, 1; not voting, 185.

On the next ballot Alabama changed from Boies to Bland and the Bland men received the announcement with wild cheers. Massachusetts seven votes (50 the delegation), the rest not voting. New York made no sign, Tillman threw his strength to Bryan. On this ballot, as well as on those which followed, New York was the only state in which no votes were cast. The result of the second ballot was: Bland, 231; Bryan, 197; Pattison, 100; Blackburn, 41; Boies, 37; McLean, 53; Matthews, 34; Pennoyer, 8; not voting, 160. Bryan and Bland had gained almost equally, but Bryan's advance had been at a much larger ratio.

On the third ballot Colorado deserted Teller for Bryan, and Oregon gave him five votes. Bland rose to 291, Bryan to 219. The pressure was telling. The crowd grew turbulent when the fourth ballot was called. Everybody knew it was the beginning of the end. Bryan men swarmed over the seats and surrounded the Illinois delegation, shouting and gesticulating. Governor Altgeld was pulled from his chair. But Illinois was still for Bland. Alabama, which missed the opportunity of placing him in nomination, turned twenty-two votes for

Bryan. California gave twelve more. Idaho left the Bland column and voted six for Bryan. Kansas gave him twenty. Minnesota gave him ten. Nevada gave him six, which had been for McLean. Oregon gave him eight. At the end of the roll call he had 280 votes to 241 for Bland. The race was all but over.

When Illinois was reached there was great excitement. Secretary of State, white with rage, rushed down the center aisle and asked permission for the Illinois delegation to withdraw for consultation. The delegates trooped out to an ante-room and were besieged in the passage by Bryan and Bland men. "For God's sake, stand by Mr. Bland," begged an Arkansas delegate, clutching the governor by the arm. Altgeld's face was white as death. The delegation had no sooner disappeared from sight than their angry voices could be heard above the roar of the convention. Presently Ohio also left the hall. It was amid the most deafening roar of voices and trampling of feet that the roll call for the fifth ballot was begun.

Kentucky deserted Blackburn and went to Bryan. Four votes from Maine, five from Maryland and six from Massachusetts were swept in by the cyclone. When Tennessee gave twenty-four votes and Virginia the same number to the victor the standards were torn from the floor and centered around the Nebraska delegates. Still Illinois did not report; the roll call was almost over before the delegates came out. The clerk demanded the vote and Illinois cast her forty-eight votes for Bryan. The hall shook under the cheers. All order was at an end. Delegates and audience arose to their feet.

At this time John R. McLean mounted his chair and

claimed the recognition of the chairman. The confusion being very great, he had some difficulty in being recognized. A message was sent to chairman Richardson and he recognized Mr. McLean, who said: "Ohio withdraws the name of John R. McLean and casts forty-six votes for William J. Bryan." This announcement caused great confusion and enthusiasm and was decisive of the result.

Ex-Governor Stone, of Missouri, then hastened to the platform and made the following speech: "Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the convention: Two or three days since I received this note (holding up a letter), which I will now read in your hearing, from Richard Parks Bland." The letter was as follows:

I wish it to be understood that I do not desire the nomination unless it is the judgment of the free silver delegates that I would be the strongest candidate. If it should at any time appear that my candidacy is the least obstruction to the nomination of any candidate who is acceptable to the free coinage delegates in the convention, or one more acceptable to a majority of those delegates than myself, I wish my name at once unconditionally withdrawn from further consideration. I am willing to wave the state instructions for me if need be, and let the free silver delegates decide the whole matter. The cause must be put above the man.

"I came to this great city," said Governor Stone, "as one of the delegates from Missouri, voicing the sentiment of the democracy of that state, to present for your deliberate consideration the name of the illustrious commoner for whom many of you have expressed preference by your votes in this convention. To those who have been our friends in the struggle, I desire now to return my grateful appreciation. But, following the directions of Mr. Bland himself, that whenever a majority of the silver delegates in this convention shall have expressed a preference for another, he desires his name unconditionally and peremptorily withdrawn, I now, in the name of Mis-

souri, lower the standard under which we have fought throughout this convention, and in its place I lift that of the gifted and glorious son of Nebraska.

We will not only nominate him, but I believe, with as much confidence as I can believe anything in the future, that we will elect him by an overwhelming majority in November, and that we will inaugurate not only a democratic administration at Washington, but one which at its close will be set down as among the purest, and ablest and the most illustrious of American history.

"So, now, gentlemen, I withdraw the name of Richard Parks Bland, and cast the thirty-four votes of our state for William J. Bryan of Nebraska."

At the close of Governor Stone's remarks the convention broke into the wildest excitement. Iowa withdrew Boies' name and cast its vote for Bryan.

The chair then recognized Senator Jones, the chairman of the Arkansas delegation, who said: "The name of Richard P. Bland having been withdrawn, the State of Arkansas desires to change her vote from Bland to Bryan."

A motion to make the nomination unanimous was answered by a storm of ayes and a roar of "no." The nomination was declared unanimous, and the convention adjourned until eight o'clock in the evening.

It was expected the Vice-Presidential nomination would be made at the evening session, but the leaders got together and fearing another stampede, this time to McLean, of Ohio, they forced an adjournment until 10 o'clock the next morning, by which time the delegates would have had an opportunity to cool off; Mr. Bryan consulted as to his wishes regarding a running mate, and most important, to allow the silver "steering" committee to get together and see what was the best thing to do.

The convention met July 11th, at 11 o'clock in the morning, and it was evident that there would be a struggle. Among the names considered and presented were McLean, of Ohio; Sewall, of Maine; Sibley, of Pennsylvania; Thurman, of Ohio; Matthews and Shively, of Indiana; Blackburn, of Kentucky; Daniel, of Virginia; Bland, of Missouri; Williams, of Massachusetts, and Harrity, of Pennsylvania. Amid great excitement the names were presented, and balloting commenced. On the first ballot McLean was ahead, and his friends predicted his nomination on the second or third ballot, or just as soon as the "complimentaries" were disposed of. At the conclusion of the third ballot the names of Sibley, Pennsylvania, McLean, of Ohio, and Bland, of Missouri, were withdrawn and Arthur Sewall, of Maine, forced to the front. On the fifth ballot he received the necessary number of votes; his nomination was then made unanimous, and the convention adjourned after a series of the most sensational meetings of the century.

A large body of the Democratic party, especially at the East, was dissatisfied with both the platform and the nomination of the National Democratic convention that assembled at Chicago in July, and no sooner had the convention adjourned than steps were taken to call another convention, and place in nomination candidates in opposition to Bryan and Sewall, upon a platform committed to a gold standard. A call was issued, stating the differences of the party.

Pursuant to this call the convention assembled at Indianapolis, Ind., on the 2d day of September, 1896, and was called to order by Senator John M. Palmer, of Illinois. There were present 824 delegates, representing forty-one states and three territories.

Ex-Governor Roswell P. Flower, of New York, was

made temporary chairman, and Senator Donald Cafferty, of Louisiana, was elected permanent chairman.

The platform reported by the committee was unanimously adopted on the following day; it stated that the declarations of the Chicago convention attacked individual freedom, the right of private contract, the independence of the judiciary, and the authority of the President to enforce federal laws, principles they could not accept; it denounced protection and its ally, free coinage of silver, as schemes for the personal profit of a few at the expense of the many; affirmed the historic Democratic doctrine of tariff for revenue only; insisted upon the maintenance of the gold standard, and the parity therewith of every dollar issued by the government, and are firmly opposed to the free and unlimited coinage of silver, and to the compulsory purchase of silver bullion. Advocated currency reform, commended the administration of President Cleveland, favored arbitration for the settlement of international disputes, liberal policy of pensions for deserving soldiers and sailors of the United States.

Condemned all efforts to defame or impair the confidence of the Supreme Court, favored the inviolability of contracts and the obligations of all good citizens to resist every illegal trust, combination, and attempt against the just rights of property and the good order of society, in which are bound up the happiness of our people.

Nominations for President were called for, and John M. Palmer, of Illinois, and E. S. Bragg, of Wisconsin, were placed in nomination. One ballot only was taken, which resulted as follows: Total vote, 882. John M. Palmer, 757½; E. S. Bragg, 124½.

Simon B. Buckner, of Kentucky, was nominated by acclamation for Vice-President, and at 4:32 p. m. the convention adjourned *sine die*.

CHAPTER XV.

THE ELECTION RETURNS.

When necessity no longer spurred me to exertion, I began to feel the effects of long continued labor and sought rest in bed. As soon as the polls were closed the representatives of the press, drawn by friendliness and enterprise, assembled in the library below to analyze the returns, while Mrs. Bryan brought the more important bulletins to my room—her face betraying their purport before I received them from her hand. As the evening progressed the indications pointed more and more strongly to defeat, and by eleven o'clock I realized that, while the returns from the country might change the result, the success of my opponent was more than probable. Confidence resolved itself into doubt, and doubt, in turn, gave place to resignation. While the compassionless current sped hither and thither, carrying its message of gladness to foe and its message of sadness to friend, there vanished from my mind the vision of a President in the White House, perplexed by the cares of state, and, in the contemplation of the picture of a citizen by his fireside, free from official responsibility, I fell asleep.

Later reports justified, in a measure, the expectation that the news from the country would be more favorable, but the changes were not sufficient to affect the result. During Wednesday and Thursday I was in communication with Chairman Jones, ready

to concede Mr. McKinley's election as soon as the National Committee received definite returns from the doubtful States. Thursday evening a telegram came from Chairman Jones announcing that sufficient was known to make my defeat certain, and I at once sent the following telegram to Mr. McKinley:

LINCOLN, NEB., November 5.

HON. WM. MCKINLEY, Canton, Ohio: Senator Jones has just informed me that the returns indicate your election, and I hasten to extend my congratulations. We have submitted the issue to the American people and their will is law,

W. J. BRYAN.

Mr. McKinley immediately wired:

CANTON, OHIO, November 6.

HON. W. J. BRYAN, Lincoln, Neb.: I acknowledge the receipt of your courteous message of congratulations with thanks, and beg you will receive my best wishes for your health and happiness.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

This exchange of messages was much commented upon at the time, though why it should be considered extraordinary I do not know. We were not fighting each other but stood as the representatives of different political ideas, between which the people were to choose. Our contest aroused no personal feeling upon the part of either, and I have no doubt that had I been elected he would as promptly have sent his congratulations. A courteous observance of the proprieties of such an occasion tends to eliminate the individual and enables opponents to contend sharply over the matters of principle, without disturbance of social relations. I look back with much satisfaction to the fact that the four political contests through which I have passed, two success-

fully and two unsuccessfully, have been free from personalities.

It may be interesting to the reader to compare the election returns of 1896 with those of 1892. On another page will be found a map showing in colors the political complexion of the States in 1892, and in addition thereto a table giving both the popular and electoral vote of the States; also a map and table giving the same information in regard to 1896.

The combined Democratic and Populist vote in 1892 was 6,595,285; my vote in 1896 was 6,511,073, showing that, leaving out of calculation the natural increase in the vote, my vote only fell 84,212 short of the vote of the two parties combined.

In the following States, Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming, which gave me their electoral vote, my popular vote was 2,427,172, being 829,712 more than the vote cast for Mr. Cleveland in 1892, in the States named, and 59,647 more than the vote cast that year for both Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Weaver.

In the following States carried by Mr. McKinley, including the States which divided their electoral vote, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia and Wisconsin, my popular vote was 4,019,294, being 56,069 in excess of the vote cast for Mr. Cleveland in 1892, and only 214,474 behind

the combined vote of Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Weaver.

Only in the following States did my vote fall below Mr. Cleveland's. Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Of the popular vote Mr. McKinley had a plurality of 596,749, which is less than the plurality given by the three States, Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts. A change of 962 votes from Mr. McKinley's column to mine in California would have given me the entire electoral vote of that State; in Oregon a change of 1,059 votes would have given me the electoral vote of that State; in Kentucky a change of 142 votes would have given me the entire electoral vote of that State; in Indiana a change of 9,002 votes would have given me the electoral vote of that State; in North Dakota a change of 2,826 votes would have given me the electoral vote of that State; in West Virginia a change of 5,445 votes would have given me the electoral vote of that State. Thus, a total change of 19,436 votes, distributed as suggested above in the States named, would have given me 48 more electoral votes, or a total of 224, a majority of 1. In those States above mentioned the total vote of 1892 was 1,449,622; in 1896 the total vote was 1,728,216, an increase of 278,594, or about 19.2 per cent., while the total increase in the nation was 1,865,198, or nearly 13.4 per cent.

This calculation is made to show how narrow was the defeat of bimetallism and what is possible for

the future. The six States above mentioned were all considered doubtful, and in those States my vote exceeded by 55,423 the total vote cast for Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Weaver in 1892.

Note. Of the electoral votes cast for Mr. Bryan, Mr. Watson received the following: Arkansas, 3; Kentucky, 1; Louisiana, 4; Missouri, 4; Montana, 1; Nebraska, 4; North Carolina, 5; South Dakota, 2; Utah, 1; Washington, 2; Wyoming, 1. Mr. Sewall received the remainder.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE EFFECT OF ANNEXATION OF THE PHILIPPINES ON AMERICAN LABOR.

BY HON. JOHN W DANIEL,

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM VIRGINIA.

It is the first step that costs. To-day we are the United States of America. To-morrow, if a treaty now pending in the Senate is ratified, we will be the United States of America and Asia. Our name, like a hoop upon a barrel, marks the boundary of our national projection and ambition. It is proposed to embody into the American Commonwealth as an integral part thereof a large and miscellaneous assortment of Asiatic islands, estimated in number at from 1,200 to 2,000, and to make citizens of the United States, with all the rights of citizenship which attach to the inhabitants of an American Territory, a large and miscellaneous and diversified assortment of people.

We are told by a number of Senators who have addressed us that of these islands and of this people we know but little. Our ignorance of them is a self-evident fact. The documents of our Government, in which have been collected such information as encyclopedias and books of travel would furnish, commence their imperfect account by telling us that both as to the islands and as to the people who inhabit them little that is accurate can be ascertained. We are invoked to do the gravest, the most serious, and solemn act that can ever be done in the movements of mankind, an act in its nature implying permanence.

It is to establish and to assert the sovereignty of the American people over these islands and over this people. For my part, I deem it inexpedient, unwise, and unjust that we should do so.

We are just emerging from a war of humanity, of liberty, and of national honor. In the beginning of that war, and in calling upon volunteers to follow our flag, both the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States declared our national purpose. Congress disclaimed in the joint resolution which led to war any intention of conquest. The President declared that forcible annexation was criminal aggression.

The war has been a glorious success. Our Navy has startled the world by the brilliancy of its achievements. Our Army has added new laurels to the chaplet of its veteran glories. Our people have been united as no people ever were united in supporting a National Administration.

Victory came on eagle's wings to our standard, and on the 1st day of January of the present year the last of the empire of Charles V vanished from the American continent and the dream of Spain for universal empire turned to dust and ashes.

In war it is the unexpected that happens. So in every great and new adventure of peace. We are asked now to sally forth 7,000 miles from our native seat to grasp, against their will, eight millions of unwilling people—to seize upon them, to take them by force of arms and deposit them, land and people, within the lines of the Constitution under the American flag—to make them an integral part of this American Republic.

I do not believe that the great body of the American people understand the significance of this treaty. I

do not believe, at least if I may judge from their utterances, that many Senators who are saying, "Vote for the treaty now and fix your policy to-morrow," understand what that treaty does irretrievably. That treaty fixes our policy. The rest of our policy is a mere matter of clerky detail. The treaty is the thoroughfare, and through and over that thoroughfare eight millions of Filipinos march into the open doorway of the American Republic. More than that, 70,000,000 Americans march into the Philippine Islands as the Filipinos march here.

It is a marriage of nations. This twain become one flesh. They become bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. Henceforth and forever, according to the terminology of this treaty, the Filipinos and Americans are one. I trust yet, that before this marriage is consummated the spirit of American constitutional liberty will arise and forbid the bans.

There is one characteristic of the speeches which have been delivered on this subject by those who favor the treaty and of the essays and editorials which doubtless has not escaped your observation. The issue joined in the debate has been too much joined upon a mere question of power. Who has told us what we are going to the Philippine Islands for? Who has told us what moral or legal compulsion we are under to go there?

Who has said that we are going to make a more perfect union or add to the general welfare, to the national defense, to the establishment of justice, or to the insurance of domestic tranquillity, or how or in what way we will secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity,—how attain by going there any of the great ends for which our Government was founded and our Constitution ordained? Upon these

subjects there has been a general if not an absolute silence.

I shall speak on this question solely from the standpoint of an American, a republican American, if you please, believing in republican doctrines and in republican institutions; a democratic American, if you please, believing in the right of this people and the right of all people to govern themselves. No obligation to any other nation, nay, no obligation to the Filipinos, however fanciful or however solid, should for a single instant disturb us from standing firmly and fixedly on this standpoint.

It is the American people who have got the first mortgage upon our diligent attention and loyalty to their interests, to their Constitution, to their principles; it is the American people who have got the preferred stock in anything that we may do or project concerning our national polity. We may have some obligations to others. They are secondary. But we have none which is not perfectly consistent with such amendment to this treaty as will preserve our national character and consummate perfectly the purposes for which the war was begun.

It is said that we can not leave the Filipinos in the hands of Spain. I agree to that. Our obligation is one of equity and is one of honor. But why leave the Filipinos in the hands of Spain? What have we to do with them and what is their relation to us that we should sally forth knightlike, with lance in hand, to do anything for or about them? It is a fact that the Filipinos helped us in our war with Spain. They became our comrades in the line of battle. The blood of the brown people of the Philippine Archipelago and the blood of the paleface from the great Northern

Republic flowed in a common stream to cast off the odious and intolerable yoke of Spain.

The obligation that we owe to the Filipinos is the obligation of comradeship. It is the obligation of fraternity. It is not pecuniary; it is honorary. It comes under that class of obligations which has as its touchstone and its watchword "noblesse oblige." Having accepted comradeship—call the comrade ally, coadjutor, coöperator, or what not—having accepted the fact of friendship and clasped hands on the perilous edge of battle, we can not renounce the hand that we there clasped and treat the man or the men who gave us those hands otherwise than as friends. That is "noblesse oblige."

What is it, if you strike the gun out of the hand in which you put the gun and aim the gun at the breast which touched elbow with your elbow when you went down to battle? What is that? I name it not, but it is not noblesse oblige. We can not leave the Filipinos in the hands of Spain. No, no, no. Americans can not so treat those who were their comrades.

What next? Recognize their independence as a nation? I say, "No." They have not yet made themselves an independent nation. We do not know whether they can or whether they will make themselves such a nation as can assume international obligations and maintain themselves in the great family of states. Recognize them and come away from the islands? No; we can not now come away from the islands. We need only look skyward to see that the birds of prey are circling around the Philippine Islands. We can neither leave them in the hands of Spain nor leave them to become the prey of the first vulture that sweeps upon them.

What next? The face of the treaty tells us how to treat them. Exactly as we have treated Cuba. We are now in military occupation of the Philippine Islands. Let us stay in military occupation of the Philippine Islands until such time as we know more about them than we do, until we have assisted them with our kind offices and with our national prestige and with our force of arms into such destiny as may fitly and justly await them, into such destiny as they have projected for themselves.

What is the difference between doing that and ratifying this treaty? It is the difference between planting an empire there and maintaining the temporary ascendancy of American power there.

The one thing, such as we have proposed and are doing in Cuba, is essentially transitory; it is ambulatory; it admits of a moment's change. The President of the United States, as the Commander in Chief of our armies, can withdraw in honor, in propriety, in justice the troops from Cuba whenever good sense and sound policy dictate. Why not leave him to do the same thing as to the Philippine Islands? With far more reason may we do that as to the Philippine Islands than with respect to Cuba.

Cuba is a natural part of the American continent. It has been, ever since we ourselves have been a nation, within the range and under the sphere of influence of the American Republic. As the Hon. Thomas Francis Bayard said when he was Secretary of State in the first administration of Mr. Cleveland, we have established a protectorate over the Western World. It has always been and it is to-day under the wing of the people of the United States out of the necessity of our geographical situation. The Philippine Islands have never been and naturally can never so be.

Why not, then, leave them in that situation in which we may determine our policy at leisure, studiously, sedately, with full comprehension of all those facts and conditions of which we now claim to know and of which we do know so little?

Before we launch forth upon this great adventure I beg to call attention to the fact that as we stand to-day we are not only the most favored nation of the world, but occupy a position more favored by Providence than any nation that ever did exist in the history of the world since time began. Our situation is absolutely ideal; it is a natural fortification. Our coast is washed east and west by the everlasting seas, which have put up an impenetrable barrier against the aggression of any other nation. As Abraham Lincoln said in one of his speeches, we are so situated that all the armies of the universe, with Napoleon Bonaparte as their general, could never manage to take a drink of water out of the Ohio River.

We are in a natural and impregnable fortress which the God of nature has put around us. North of us are our own kin, a people who in their situation, so far from menacing us, constitute a bond to keep the peace unto themselves, and also make an additional bond to keep the peace with the great mother of nations from which they and we ourselves sprung. South of us are the Central and South American republics. Of all of them we were the prototype and exemplar. They are the intellectual and moral children of the American brain; they are all friendly to us; they can not be otherwise.

We are about to build the Nicaragua Canal. I did not vote for the particular measure, not because I did not want the canal, for I believe in it, but in one way or another that canal is about to be built. It

will chain together the armor of our national defense. After that canal shall have been built, we will not be like Achilles, we will be impregnable from the crown of our head to the sole of our feet, including the heel.

Every annexation we have ever made to the American commonwealth has been an annexation in contemplation of our Constitution and in symmetrical outline with the projections of nature—rivers, mountains, and seas, which are the great lawgivers to peoples.

They tell us that Jefferson was a great annexationist. So he was; but, expansionist as he was, he drew the line on expansion. He interpreted the oracles of nature, if indeed they needed interpretation, for their language is not oracular in the olden oracular sense. Cuba we want, he said, for it is an outpost of the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea, but we want no annexation that will require a navy to defend it.

If we look introspectively we find that this nation, having now established its ascendancy in the wings of the republic in the Sandwich Islands and in Cuba and in Porto Rico, is a perfect, symmetrical body, becoming homogeneous in all its parts, dedicated to the principles of human liberty, and it goes forth like a bridegroom from his chamber, rejoicing as a strong man to run a race. Annex the Philippine Islands to this country, and what is it then? Something beyond the boundaries indicated in its Constitution, something beyond any ideal that ever entered the dreams of our fathers, something that is cumbrous and unnatural, something that is heterogeneous and surprising, something that is amphibious, something that is half man and half fish, something that never would have been born in the natural course of human projection, something that is the haphazard chance of

war, which we are asked to change into a permanent establishment.

When we contemplate the one hundred and twenty-five years of the history of the American Republic and the anterior years in which it was forming in these forests of America, we discern that there has been but one impediment to our national harmony and to our national growth. For that impediment the generation that founded this Republic and its successors were not responsible. They were the unwilling heirs of unwilling and protesting ancestors. The Dutch ship that landed at Jamestown bringing here another race brought also Pandora's box. The interjection of a race nonassimilable with the American people has been the fly in the ointment of American institutions, of American peace, of American history.

That interjection came from war and came from distant colonial establishments. The untutored black man in his native haunts was seized upon by war, was torn from the habitat for which nature had intended him, was put on board an alien ship by an alien people, and was brought here and sold. There is no tragedy in human history so pitiable, and none, if it be justly contemplated, that is so instructive. There lies across the border of yonder stream an old Commonwealth upon which that tragedy inflicted its most terrific curse.

Twenty-seven times did the people of that Commonwealth protest through their legislative assemblies against the intrusion of this foreign and this alien mixture into their Commonwealth; but trade, the commercial spirit overriding the great liberty-loving principles of the British race, foisted them upon us with bayonets. The rest of the story I need not tell; but that one ingredient in the American Common-

wealth turned brother against brother, sowed the seeds of discord into that which otherwise would have been a perfect Union. Without that we were a homogeneous people.

Go into Maine or Louisiana; go into Tennessee or Massachusetts; go into Virginia or Ohio or Illinois, and the American people are like unto themselves, with the same ideas of government, with the same devoted and undying love of liberty, with the same sense of justice and of equity and of honor. This one thing poured "the sweet milk of concord into hell."

We are happily beginning to adjust ourselves to the conditions and complications and infinite troubles that this one ancient crime brought down upon us. We are happily at peace with ourselves to-day throughout all this American nation, and I thank God I have lived to see this day. It matters not on which side a man fought in the civil war; he is devoted to-day to the flag of his country and to everything that that flag stands for. He honors and esteems the President of the United States not only with the naked loyalty that belongs to the dignity of his great office, but with that grateful esteem and with that open and honest admiration for great wisdom and public virtue and broad and enlightened patriotism and for sweet and gracious and friendly ways.

Now, at this moment, perfect in every defense, at peace with all the nations of the world, blessed with everything, and with more than everything, that any other nation was ever blessed with, we are challenged to go forth upon a great expedition 7,000 miles away from our home, to lay the heavy hand of our sovereign power upon 8,000,000 people and introduce again into the American commonwealth the fatal and

insidious element which came near being the cause of its destruction.

There is one thing that neither time nor education can change. You may change the leopard's spots, but you will never change the different qualities of the races which God has created in order that they may fulfill separate and distinct missions in the cultivation and civilization of the world. The Indian of one hundred and twenty-five years ago is the Indian of to-day—ameliorated, to a certain extent civilized, and yet the wisdom of our forefathers, when, in the Constitution, they set them apart as one people, separate and distinct from the great dominant race which had come to take this land and to inhabit it, is indicated in what we are still doing and must forever do with them so long as they maintain their tribal relations and so long as they are Indians. Racial differences, differences of religion, differences in mode of thought, differences in psychology, the subtle analyses of man have put them asunder.

Apart from that, there are many objections to the treaty as it stands. It is objectionable from a military and strategic standpoint. It destroys the solidarity of this nation. It throws out an American salient far beyond any line of our natural or projected development. That salient will be the first point of attack in any plan of battle against this nation. We can no longer hug our native shores and bid the world defiance; we have flung our glove far down into the arena of the nations, and the first day that war is declared between this American Republic and any other great nation of the world the prow of the battle ship, with its mighty guns, will be turned toward the Philippine Islands.

What then? Anticipating that, if we take the Phil-

ippines to-day we must commence to fortify them to-morrow. There are from 1,200 to 2,000 of those islands. The fortification of one island may not defend another. Siege guns have got to be put upon every harbor and around their cities, at an expense of millions upon millions of dollars. A separate navy has got to watch them and be ready to defend them.

Naturally enough, "birds of a feather flock together." The Philippine treaty and a great standing army walk into the halls of Congress hand in hand, one behind and close upon the heels of the other. In a military and strategic point of view no nation ever challenged fate by so unwise and unnecessary a step as to fling out an American salient upon the Asiatic coast and say, "Here is the place where we are willing to establish our sovereignty, and, if need be, to defend it against the world in arms." It means militarism to follow—its essential corollary, its necessary and its inevitable consequence.

The men who favor the standing Army to-day have read in the lines of that treaty the bugle call "To arms! To arms!" They have seen with that treaty you can no more rely permanently and fixedly upon the American volunteer, the pride of the nation, the citizen soldier, ever ready to take his gun and go down to the shore to defend his native land; that you must have, if you are going there to maintain your sovereignty, a regular army; you must introduce the regular soldier into American life, and when he comes he will come with all the necessary consequences.

The American who has heretofore visited Europe has come back making a contrast between European nations and his own country which was infinitely reassuring and delightful. In no public place in Europe are you ever out of sight of a regular soldier. You

will see the redcoat on every court green in Britain, at every theater, at every shop, on every highway—the man with a gun, ever ready to fight; the soldier of the nation whose gates in the temple of Janus are never closed, the nation which makes its living by war.

If you go to France, you see, with all her power of recovery after the invasion of Germany, she there has the regular soldier on the workman's bench, and the swish of the horsehair plume will be heard with the rustle of every dress. The French grenadier is a social and familiar picture in every domestic scene of life. We are apt to picture the great scenic phases of a nation, to point to their triumphs for their national character. The American would point to Manila Bay, or to Gettysburg Heights, or to Malvern Hill, or to Maryes Hill, or to some other place where American armies marched to death without flinching, and say, "Behold! there is what the American is!"

The greatest triumph of the American nation was a silent and inconspicuous triumph. It was a triumph that was not heralded with the blast of the bugle nor decorated with the ornamental flag. It was the triumph of the American people when they laid down their arms in 1865 and dispersed, each man quietly to his workshop and to his fireside. North and South participated in that triumph.

Even men as wise as Grant and Sherman had said that when you disperse these Southern armies they will break up into bands; one band will infest a mountain fastness, another band will roam the plains, another band will go to the prairies, and for years after the civil war you will have rumors of strife and disagreeable incidents, and you will have to keep a standing army to meet with those incidental troubles

that come in the aftermath of battle. There was no such trouble. The people of our race when they fight mean war, and when they surrender they surrender as flatly and as decisively and as utterly as any people who mean what they say and who believe that it is the truth which makes men free and not falsehood, and not trifling with great concerns.

So the American people shook hands upon the battlefield, which both sides had illustrated with its splendid prowess and with its noble sacrifice. As General Grant fitly says in his Memoirs, "They shook hands as old friends who had been long parted, neither showing resentment." Why should they have shown resentment? War is not personal; it is a matter of principle; it is a matter of duty. There is no reason why the man who does the right as he sees the right may not look the world in the eye and grasp the honest hand of another man, however much he may have differed with him.

I want to see that triumph repeated here. The war is done, in all its projected ideals and with all its natural and just consequences. Spain has vanished from the American continent. Cuba has been set free. It was a proud day for the American citizen; it was a day which made our hearts thrill with exceeding pride and joy when the American flag shot forth into the sky over the dungeon walls of Morro Castle, and the stars heard the message that a people had come who founded their domain not upon the sword but upon human rights.

This is the only great government in the world that laid a corner stone before it put up the foundation of the building. Other nations have been formed from the various circumstances which made men connect together for their mutual defense and interest and



Geo. W. Daniel.



J. B. Wilson

safety. They have grown through the long processes of time from various motives and incidents, but our birth was signalized by a peculiar thing, and that germ which we planted in the beginning of our institutions has grown and waxed and is to-day strong and mighty.

We founded a government upon the recognition of human rights—that is our distinction—the right of men to be free, the right of men to govern themselves; and no man in this Government to-day but feels that he has an immediate, an intimate, a close and undying tie between the highest of its officers, between the most solemn ordinances of its constitutions, between its judges, its legislators, and himself. It is his legislature; it is his Senate; it is his House of Representatives; it is his Constitution; it is his Declaration of Independence; it is his country, and he has his rights in that country, and that country gets back in return his allegiance and his love.

Let us ask ourselves why we should annex the Philippine Islands. I spoke of the debt of equity and honor which we owed the Filipinos. It was a debt of friendship. Is the annexation of them against their will friendship? La Fontaine has a fable of which I am reminded by the proposition. There was a master once, he says, who had a favorite dog, and the dog was accustomed to bring the master his dinner in a basket. One day upon the street with the basket in his mouth going to his master's workshop he was beset by hungry curs. The basket was knocked out of his mouth and the victuals were spilled upon the ground, whereupon the dog, before he addressed himself to the hungry curs who were after him, commenced to gulp down the dinner. Just then the master appeared upon the scene and reproached the dog.

He gave a most excellent excuse. "Why, my dear master," he says, "I was taking the dinner faithfully to you when these hungry curs jumped upon me, and as the dinner was spilled, I knew you would rather have your faithful dog to consume it than to fill up the mouths of these hungry curs."

Having been once friendly to the Filipinos, and seeing that, according to the way the world wags, some vulture is after them, we have concluded that since they have to be eaten up, they would rather have their good old American friend undertake the benevolent assimilation than to have any other persons undertake it. That dog of the fable was an exceedingly smart and philosophical dog. For dog logic, I do not think he has ever been excelled; but upon my word, sir, I do not feel that, as smart as he was, I can yet agree to put him up instead of the American eagle, and accept the moral of his tale in place of the teachings of Thomas Jefferson and Daniel Webster and Abraham Lincoln, and all the great men who have guided the American people in their hours of emergency.

What do we want to go to the Philippines for, and what are we after, and wherein will we be any better or stronger or nobler or richer after we have gone there? What is the temptation to us? Having told one fable I find myself tempted to tell another. In the old times when there was transmigration of souls between the different types of animated nature, it is said that a cat found herself suddenly transformed into a beautiful lady. Nothing could have exceeded the charms of her person and nothing the propriety of her behavior. But one day, as she sat the picture of demure and enchanted beauty, a mouse chanced to run across the floor. She did not shriek, as perhaps some of her prototypes would have done, but she instantly jumped

upon and devoured the mouse. The feline instinct was still there.

The American Republic set itself upon a different plan from the anterior nations. It said that all men are equal. There was the one word set like a diamond in the Declaration of Independence. It said, furthermore, all just governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed. It made a Constitution in which it put up bars of defense for the rights of man and for the rights of the community. It robed itself in the robes of liberty. It set the Goddess of Liberty over its Capitol. Nothing could exceed the beauty of its nobility or the wisdom of its design, and everything has gone well with us until this Philippine mouse has happened to run across the floor, and the old native instinct of taking something has broken loose in us again.

I think I heard a Senator say one day that all of our ancestors were pirates. I take no issue with him. The great prepotent family that has molded American institutions and has hewed out this massive and eternal stone of human liberty were descendants of the great northern races that put freedom in Great Britain, as far as it went, but it once rode the northern seas under the raven flag. But when they got here in this beautiful land, when they felt the pinch of ancient and distant tyranny controlling their affairs, they turned over a new leaf and adopted a set of good resolutions, and Providence aided them in the fulfillment of them as it had blessed no other people since time began.

But there is a chance to take somebody, there is a chance to get some more land, there is a chance to expand in mere material and numerical strength, to seem to be mightier, and the old instinct has jumped

up again and the old appetite has broken out again, and a short-sighted policy is attempted to be placed upon us to override all that we have hitherto accomplished.

We are already beginning to get the Asiatic flavor in our American utterances. The people talk of destiny after the manner of the Orient, after the way of those who bow themselves to fate. We have also got a little of Spanish accent and vogue into our American manners. When we say settle this question now in your treaty, it is *mañana, mañana*; to-morrow, to-morrow.

More than this, I do not think any nation of the earth or the monarchical essays and pessimists of the world have ever run down the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution of the United States as much as I have heard it run down, belittled, and minimized in the last few weeks under the influence of this debate. It seems now that it was not much of a Declaration after all. It seems now that it was not much of a Constitution after all. It seems now that there is no provision of it and no sentiment in it and no principle of it that can not be cheese-separated away and can not have some nice sharp quillet of the law in a diplomatic way to let it down easily and dismiss it from our further consideration.

I never expected to be called on to defend the Declaration of Independence in this Hall. I never expected to hear its phrases used as if they were airy nothings, rhetorical flourishes, empty vaporings of a revolutionary assemblage. I think that Abraham Lincoln has correctly expounded the Declaration of Independence, and I think in the great debate which he held with Judge Douglas when they were candidates for the Senate from Illinois that he met every

phase of the argument which has here been adduced against it.

I think he defined it and interpreted it just as its immortal author meant it—Thomas Jefferson, the pioneer, the founder, the enunciator of a principle which has done more to mold American institutions, to swing them back into the right groove when they got wrong, than any other. He did not mean that men were equal in all respects, neither in stature nor in intellect, nor in moral character, nor in possession. What he meant was that they were equally entitled to liberty. When he spoke of all governments deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, he meant that the government of a people must derive its just powers from the consent of the people over whom the government was stretched and to which it applied.

It is literally true that it means the consent of some of the governed, not all. But, according to republican and democratic institutions a majority have a right to express the views of the community, and the consent of all is expressed in the sense of a majority of that government of whom they are the people. It does not imply that because a man is free he may necessarily vote. Our Constitution has dealt with that question. It has left it to the States, and in the nature of things the States must determine who shall vote.

The woman is as free as the man, but she does not vote. The boy 20 years of age is as free and may be wiser and stronger and better than the boy of 23, but one votes and the other does not. In the nature of things the sovereign body of the whole people, who are the majority acting for the entire commonwealth, must determine the degrees of ability—mental, moral,

and physical—which are worthy of the deposit of that portion of the political power.

But whether or not the power to vote is possessed or dispossessed by reason of mental or moral weakness or sex or age or condition, all the citizens of a commonwealth that is free are themselves free, and all of them are equal in the enjoyment of their lives. Each of them has the same defense; all have the same liberty. Each of them has the same protection in the pursuit of happiness under just and equal laws, which is the possession of each and every one. That is what the Declaration of Independence means. That is the manner in which every State in this Union has interpreted it. That is the way in which it is accepted in Territory and State alike.

But it is said that with respect to Porto Rico we have one idea and with respect to the Philippine Islands another. Gentlemen who are opposed to the propositions which I am maintaining say that you went to Porto Rico by force of arms. You dispossessed the sovereignty of Spain. You accepted sovereignty from Spain. You have established yourselves upon that island without asking the consent of the governed and without any regard to your Declaration of Independence.

I make two answers to their proposition. In the first place, I say that naturally the two places are different. Porto Rico is an outpost of the American commonwealth. It is under the jurisdiction of our Monroe law, which is as much a law as if it were in our written Constitution. It is essential to our self-defense. The first law of nature is the inherent attribute of a free State as much as of any other.

Furthermore, I say that the people of Porto Rico have made no objection to our sovereignty. They

have not established another government, as the Filipinos have done. They have not raised another revolution, as the Filipinos have done. They have not asked us not to annex them, as the Filipinos have done. While the matter does not rest in the evidence of documents, yet according to our general and public information they welcomed the American flag. They accepted us with outstretched arms. But be that as it may, all rules have some exceptions. Political truths, however clear, however pure, however well defined, can not move with the accuracy of a mathematical equation nor with the symmetry of the starry motions above. Mr. Lincoln answered this objection, made in another case, to the Declaration of Independence :

It may be argued that there are certain conditions that make necessities and impose them upon us, and to the extent that a necessity is imposed upon a man he must submit to it. I think that was the condition in which we found ourselves when we established this Government. We had slaves amongst us. We could not get our Constitution unless we permitted them to remain in slavery. We could not secure the good we did secure if we grasped for more; and having of necessity submitted to that much, it does not destroy the principle that is the charter of our liberties. Let that charter stand as our standard.

So I say with respect to Porto Rico. While the logic may not be justified by the facts, assume that it was the fact that the Porto Ricans did not want us. It is a necessity of the American Republic. We can not help ourselves. The God of nature, who put that island near our shore, made it a natural outpost of our own defense.

A captain of artillery that carries his battery over a field or demolishes a house in order to get at the enemy does not destroy the private property that he occupies for the emergency in contempt of any of the rights of man. He does it not because he wants to, not that it may not wound his feelings, not that it may not be against his natural instincts and principles,

but because the necessity of defense is upon him, and he must.

It is often in the path of the most noble and gracious nations, those of the highest conception, that they must sometimes break their models. They can not help it. They live in a world of trouble. They are surrounded by the difficult circumstances and situations and complexions of war, pestilence, famine, and invasion. They must do not the best that is conceivable, not the best that some dreamer in his closet might bring up to himself in some sweet imagination, but the best that that case and those conditions admit of.

This we have done with respect to Porto Rico. We can not let another nation take her. That is as old as the Monroe doctrine. We were obliged to drive the Spanish out of her in order to consummate a righteous war. In the nature of things the sovereignty was devolved upon us by the law of nature and of nations.

But how is it as to the Filipinos? Is there any necessity there? Is there any necessity for our taking the Philippine Islands? It is a necessity which no man has mentioned. If there is any sound policy and wise judgment in establishing our sovereignty there in contradistinction to our temporary occupancy, no man has disclosed that policy or made known his confidential views.

Through many of the speeches of those who say "Ratify the treaty" there runs a sense of distrust of what they are doing; there runs a sense of preference for what we propose to do. They say, "Ratify the treaty now; come and we will talk about policy tomorrow."

The policy is wrapped up in the treaty. The policy

is determined by the treaty. The policy that will follow is a mere minor detail. If you have military occupancy there, as you have in Cuba, you may fold your tents like the Arab and quietly steal away, or sail away, or march away, or get away any night or morning that you please.

It is not a question of hauling down the flag. The flag now is a mere casual visitor there. It is no more fixed there than it is fixed in Pennsylvania avenue when it sweeps down at the head of a regiment. It merely waves there over a ship and where it is carried by an American soldier. But once fix sovereignty there and its roots go down to the center of the earth like a fee simple deed, and its stars go upward until they mingle with those in space. It is sovereignty, the most permanent act of human life, the most fixed and immovable thing that ever nation did or could do.

And what excuse is there for it? I wish to quote with accuracy some of the gentlemen who have so earnestly advocated this treaty. We are told that we are bound up in certain alternatives; that this is the least injurious alternative; not that they want it; they deprecate it; but they submit to it, so to speak, against their judgment and against their will as a thing per se, and hope to-morrow we will rectify any trouble or any wrong or any mischief which we may make.

Peace, it is said, is in this treaty; peace—a pleasing name to conjure with. “Blessed are the peacemakers.” Are our friends upon the other side sure that this treaty means peace? Are they sure that the spoken word will be substantiated by subsequent facts? Undoubtedly it means peace with Spain. There is nothing else in the future but peace with Spain. There is no contingency that can revive war

with Spain. There is nothing that we would do with this treaty that can affect Spain.

Ah, but amend it, they say, and you delay. We are acting for all time. We are acting for immortality, not for a few days or a few weeks or a few months. Aye, would a few years be a long vestibule to that infinite stretch of time that goes with sovereignty?

But this treaty is easily amended. You have only to substitute in respect to the Philippine Islands what you have done as to Cuba, and it is done. If there are votes here to do that, it can be done next Monday. Do you think Spain will not consent? Why do you think so? There is nothing in the nature of things from which any man can fancy that Spain would not readily assent. She has done so in one case with respect to Cuba, and she did it there simply because we asked it. She did it in Cuba against her wishes. She wanted us to annex Cuba on account of her Spanish citizens there, for she thought that the Spanish people there and the Spanish soldiers there and the Spanish property there would all be safer and better under the permanent sovereignty of the United States than in the chance medley of military occupation with Cuban independence hovering over it. But against the wishes of Spain we said, "No; we prefer only a military occupation here."

Now, if Spain assented to our wishes in that regard, why not as to the other? If she assented to our wishes with respect to a state lying upon our shores, with which we have a natural affinity, a manifest and inevitable destiny of close communion, why would she not also have assented to our suggestion with respect to the Philippine Islands?

But suppose she does not like it. We did not go into this war for the pleasure and satisfaction of Spain,

We went into it much against her liking, and we should not cease this war until we have registered our will, and not the Spanish will, upon the subject-matters with which we have to deal. She could have no sensible, reasonable, justifiable, or even plausible objection.

Some gentlemen have said that there is the same thing in the relinquishment of sovereignty and in the cession of territory. There is as much difference between them as there is between a hawk and a hand-saw. The cession of sovereignty is a contract and a grant between two parties. The ceding sovereign is the grantor; the grantee sovereign accepts it, and there is a mutual and interchangeable obligation and fixity of relation between them. A relinquishment is a one-sided affair, that is to say, with respect to the obligations it creates, not with respect to the obligations which it exerts and fulfills.

It is mere letting go upon the one side without the undertaking of any peculiar relation or obligation upon the other except what it sees fit to undertake, and that this was perfectly understood is illustrated in the note of our American commissioners at Paris, who, addressing the Spanish commissioners, set forth to them that perfect understanding of the difference between relinquishment and a cession, with a quotation of learned authorities defining the distinctions between them. But the most ordinary mind can comprehend them.

If Spain relinquishes her authority to us it leaves us free-handed and unbound, and we may do as we please with respect to the Philippine Islands. It does not bind us and obligate us to her to put our sovereignty there to stay. It leaves our generals and our troops there; it leaves the President of the United States here, and,

as in other cases of annexation, in Florida, in Mexico, and in numerous instances which are familiar in all the writings of our international and constitutional writers, a relinquishment would leave us as master of the situation, with no one to dictate to us, with no one to be bound to, but with America to work out her own will according to the pleasure of the Senate and of the House of Representatives hereafter.

Now, I think that some of our learned friends upon the other side have misconceived and have misstated this case. I think the journals of the country have misconceived and have misstated it. I will read a paragraph from a very intelligent editorial in the Hartford Courant, where it sums up this case to its readers :

There are some things—

Says this writer—

There are some things the ratification of the treaty will not do. It will not make the Philippines a part of the United States. It will not extend the Constitution of the United States over those islands. It will not make the Filipinos American citizens and electors. It will give them no opportunity which they did not enjoy just as fully this time last year to compete with American workmen in the labor market, nor will it let in their products free of duty to compete with American products. The ratification of the treaty will leave them outside the Constitution, outside the tariff, outside the immigration laws. It will not enable them to scramble over or crawl under. We may add, for the more effectual reassurance of some excessively alarmed orators, that it will not in the least affect the difference between the Philippine climate and the American climate, nor shorten by a single marine league the distance from Manila to New York.

It will not change climate or shorten distance; I admit that, and that is one reason why I am opposed to the treaty. The climate is one which Americans can never colonize. We speak of establishing a Philippine colony. We will do no more in the Philippines than Great Britain in more than a hundred years has been able to do in India. There is no British colony there except in the most paltry and insignificant sense of the word. Not 3 per cent yet are British people. You can not establish any American

colony in the Philippine Islands. The colony would perish.

You can not carry the American people to the Philippine Islands. The people who live there can not have the qualities, physical, moral, or intellectual, that Americans possess. It is not a colony that we propose to establish; it is a dependency, a perpetual dependency, an eternal serfdom, a species of national and international slavery modeled after the Russian pattern, in which the slave goes with the land.

This newspaper writer is mistaken in every one of his legal propositions, according to the Constitution of the United States, according to the opinion of our jurists and publicists that have written thereon, according to the decisions of the United States Supreme Court that have adjudicated thereon, and likewise according to the natural and inborn principles of American liberty which we all possess.

The Philippine Islands will become a part of the United States the moment that the treaty is ratified. The Constitution of the United States will extend over them the moment that it is ratified. It will make the Filipinos American citizens, though not electors—I admit the electoral proposition—as soon as it is ratified. It will give them an opportunity immediate, instant, that they did not enjoy this time last year or any year before, to compete with American workmen in the labor market. It will let in their products free of duty to compete with American products just as soon as Congress has performed its constitutional mandate and its sworn duty to extend the actual application of the laws to them.

The ratification of the treaty will not leave them outside of the Constitution. It will enable them to scramble over or crawl under or get in, any way that

they please to come in. It will nullify our immigration laws against alien labor. It will nullify our immigration laws against all the races of the East who are at present prohibited from coming here. It will put the goods and manufactures and products of the Philippine Islands and all of its workmen into competition with those of the American workmen.

Why do I say this? It is because the American Constitution is a free Constitution. It is because it has constantly been getting freer and freer. It is because our decisions have fully interpreted it and because our statutes have enacted legislation in behalf of all who may come in our jurisdiction. It stands at the gate waiting and ready to present them with these rights and privileges as soon as the treaty puts them in. It will not require a special act of Congress, because Congress has enacted by anticipation for all who come within our jurisdiction.

I will read three sections, page 347, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, sections 1977, 1978, and 1979. But before I read them I wish to make one observation.

Suppose that the ratification of this treaty did leave the Philippine Islanders in this degraded and extra-constitutional condition. Suppose it left them with no rights that an American Senator was bound to respect and applied to them in the most contemptuous manner that sentence which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Platt] told us the other day was such a scar upon American jurisprudence; do we want any such people in the American commonwealth? There was no sentence which was uttered about our civil war which probed down deeper into the nature of things or more illuminated our then unhappy condition than the sentence which Abraham

Lincoln uttered in his New York speech, when he said that this Republic could not remain half free and half slave.

This Republic can not remain, nor by my will can it be created, half free and half dependent. In the nature of things the Philippine Islands will never be fitted to become American States. Their race forbids it; their climate forbids it; their conditions in all respects forbid it. Therefore, if the gentlemen who deny them constitutional rights can have their way, it is for the creation of a perpetual dependency, of an absolute despotism annexed to a republic, that they are seeking.

I know not in what attitude the presentation of the Philippine argument is most repulsive. I know not which form of presentation of it is more obnoxious to our people and our institutions. If they are unfitted for liberty and you propose to deny to them the right to a free constitution and to be a free people, you have to raise in your midst a lot of Egyptian taskmasters and satraps, pro-consuls, governors-general, intendentes; and you march forth with this treaty not only to take the Spanish shoe as the master of the Philippine Islands, but to adopt the Spanish policy for their government.

I know, from the superior character and experience of the American people, that they are a humane people. I know that they are noble and high-minded, and that in no situation on the earth will they ever become so cruel, so corrupt, or so disregardful of the rights of man as their Spanish predecessors. But I know this also: That they turn their faces the downward way.

I know also, if the history of the world has left any lessons for our guidance, that when you raise great

standing armies, when you have vast commerce, when you appoint governors-general, when you make profitable employments for men whom you set as task-masters over others, in the nature of things, by the inevitable tendencies and inclinations of human nature, you set up a great establishment in which there is every incitement of ambition and wealth for its perpetuity, and that those who share in its honors, in its emoluments, in its profits, however honorably, will be disposed to a continuance of a condition of things which is to their profit. It may be that we will do better than any other nation has ever done; I know we will do better than Spain; but at its best it is a most perilous relation; it is a most injurious relation; it is a relation that all should pray against who have ever felt the power of that prayer, "Lead us not into temptation."

I want to read an authority from our Supreme Court to which, I believe, attention has not yet been called. It is with respect to our Territories. A Territory of the United States is just as much a part of it as any foot of soil in it. A citizen or inhabitant of a Territory, with permanent residence therein, is just as much a citizen of the United States as the President of the United States or any Senator here. It is true, the limit of his prerogatives may be curtailed by the conditions of his environment, but the Territory is a part of the Union and the man is a citizen of the Union.

Nay, in international transactions and to the outer world a Territory or district of the United States is undistinguishable from a State. This was decided by our Supreme Court in the case of *De Geofroy vs. Riggs*. The decision is to be found in 133 United States Reports, page 642. It was a discussion of our

treaty with France of 1800, in which we had accorded to French citizens certain rights in the United States. The question arose whether or not a Territory of the United States was a State within the contemplation of that treaty. The Supreme Court said that it was. Judge Field, giving the opinion, said respecting the particular articles of the treaty which he was considering:

This article is not happily drawn. It leaves in doubt what is meant by "States of the Union." Ordinarily these terms would be held to apply to those political communities exercising various attributes of sovereignty which compose the United States, as distinguished from the organized municipalities known as Territories and the District of Columbia. And yet separate communities, with an independent local government, are often described as States, though the extent of their political sovereignty be limited by relations to a more general government or to other countries. (Halleck on International Law, chapter 3, sections 5, 6, 7.)

The term is used in general jurisprudence and by writers on public law as denoting organized political societies with an established government. Within this definition the District of Columbia, under the Government of the United States, is as much a State as any of those political communities which compose the United States. Were there no other territory under the Government of the United States, it would not be questioned that the District of Columbia would be a State within the meaning of international law; and it is not perceived that it is any less a State within that meaning because other States and other territory are also under the same Government.

By this treaty there occurs what the international law writers call a collective naturalization of all the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands as American citizens, and to them attach instantly all those personal rights and immunities which belong to American citizens. What are those rights, privileges, and immunities? I have collected our constitutional provisions respecting citizenship. It will be seen, and clearly seen, from their perusal and interpretation that instantly the Filipinos are made American citizens. Our constitutional provisions on the subject of citizenship are as follows:

First, section 2, Article IV:

The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

That applies to the citizens of the Territories as well as to the citizens of those communities which are

technically called States in our Constitution. The right to vote is not a privilege and immunity of American citizenship. This was decided in the case of *Minor vs. Happersett*, in 21 Wallace, which showed that the right to vote was a matter which rested within the prerogative of the State; but the other rights, all the rights of commerce, of transportation, of property, of buying and selling, exchanging, apply as well to a citizen of a Territory as to a citizen of a State under the decision which I have just read from the Supreme Court with respect to a Territory being considered as a State for certain purposes and in certain effects and intents.

Then comes this provision in section 3, Article IV:

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

Territory in that sense seems to have referred to the actual, physical territory which the United States owns, not only by eminent domain, but by immediate, actual fee-simple title. Certainly it did not apply to enabling the United States to take away any of the muniments and privileges of American citizens, but only applied to those rules and regulations respecting the actual property of the United States, and by extension of interpretation with respect to the government of that property, over that territory of which the United States was the immediate sovereign.

Then, we have Article XIV, section 1:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States—

Certainly, all persons born under annexation would come within the immediate language of this clause—

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Then comes Article XV:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Without the amendment of that clause in the Constitution, Article XV, if the Congress of the United States hereafter should choose, after annexing the Philippine Islands, to give the right to vote to a portion of its intelligent population, it is obliged to make no distinction on account of race or color, and the Tagalos, the Negritos, and all the various inferior tribes of that country have got to be considered with respect to race and color on the same basis and to the same intent and purpose as a white-born American citizen.

So much for the language of the Constitution. There is a principle of international law which applies to its construction. It is true that Congress may enact a uniform system of naturalization for foreigners, but there is no method of naturalizing one who owes allegiance to the country, and who by a priori act has been made a citizen. By international law, well known, interpreted by our courts, fixed and settled, the annexation of the territory is what is called a collective naturalization of its people. It puts them within the jurisdiction of the United States.

I will read on that subject the opinion of a distinguished jurist whose legal opinions have always been greatly respected, not only in this Hall but throughout the country. He was once chairman of the Judiciary Committee of this body—the Hon. George F. Edmunds, of Vermont. He states that—

All the people of these islands who were the subjects of Spain will become citizens of the United States by the mere act of cession unless the treaty of cession should provide that those who wished could remain subjects of Spain and aliens as to the United States. This has been a necessary rule of international law for hundreds of years; and the rule is founded upon the obvious fact that the people of every country, or of any part of it, must owe allegiance to and be

subject to the government of some sovereign power, be it a tribe, or emperor, or king, or republic, and must, unless they are slaves or serfs, have the rights of such.

But a republic can have no subjects. Its people must be either citizens, slaves, or aliens.

If aliens, they are the subjects or citizens of some other power which is bound to protect them. The transfer, therefore, of the sovereignty of Spain over the Philippines to the United States makes all her subjects at once citizens of the United States.

If citizens of the United States, they have all the rights that belong to other citizens in the Territories, whether on the mainland or on islands of the sea. Neither geography nor distance has anything to do with it.

Nay, looking beyond this deliberate and learned opinion of an able constitutional jurist, we will see that the treaty itself acquiesces in this interpretation of international law. It assumes that the great body of the Philippine people are created by its passage as American citizens, and it provides for those who do not wish to become so maintaining their allegiance to the Spanish Government under certain conditions which it prescribes.

I read a little from the case of *Pollard vs. Hagan*, in 3 Howard, page 312:

It cannot be admitted that the King of Spain could, by treaty or otherwise, impart to the United States any of his royal prerogatives; and much less can it be admitted that they have capacity to receive or power to exercise them. Every nation acquiring territory, by treaty or otherwise, must hold it subject to the constitution and laws of its own government.

Again I read from the case of the *United States vs. Wong Kim Ark* (169 U. S. Reports, 705):

Congress has no authority "to restrict the effect of birth, declared by the Constitution to constitute a sufficient and complete right to citizenship."

Again, I read from *Crandall vs. Nevada* (6 Wallace, 35):

All citizens of the United States have the right to enter its seaports, to pass freely from one part of its territory to another, and to reside in any State.

The whole Philippine population, if they wish to, can come freely to any part of the United States and locate anywhere in the United States. They can bring their goods with them, and they are unamenable to any tax law of the United States, unless it be

the temporary order of military authority in its course of being supervened by the civil power of the United States.

By the annexation of territory—

Says Chief Justice Marshall—

the relations of the inhabitants with their former sovereign are dissolved, and new relations are created between them and the government which has acquired their territory. The same act which transfers the territory transfers the allegiance of those who remain in it. (American Ins. Co. vs. Canter, 1 Peters, 542.)

It has been intimated that we can make any sort of tariff for these people. It has been time and again decided by the Supreme Court of the United States that as allegiance is created in the citizen to the Government, and the protection of the Government is extended to the citizen by the act which creates sovereignty, that then and there he becomes entitled to be governed by the same uniform laws with respect to taxation and everything else as any other citizen.

I do not lose sight of the fact that there may be an intervening stage in which civil authority may be withheld until military authority has passed, but that military occupancy is essentially transient. The moment the cession is made the decree of its cessation has been pronounced.

The moment of cession is the moment of constitutional accession, and with constitutional accession it becomes the solemn and sworn duty of Congress to provide equal laws to extend these equal immunities, to secure these equal privileges, and there can be no construction favorable to any idea which has been maintained by gentlemen who declare that the people of these territories will not succeed to the rights of American citizens except in the supposition that Congress will act in fraud of their sworn duty; that they will refuse to obey the instrument which they have

sworn to support; that they will make a mockery and scorn of American institutions, and, by mere arbitrary power, sit in their seats and withhold the law which they have sworn to create, and refuse the protection and immunity which it is their duty to extend.

This is what gentlemen mean who are learned and skilled in knowledge of the Constitution when they say that the Constitution does not immediately extend all rights, privileges, and immunities. The Constitution presumes a physical instrument to execute it; it presumes an honorable, honest, and conscientious instrument; and their construction is only justifiable and warrantable upon the assumption that Congress will turn its back upon the Constitution and refuse to execute its sworn duty.

In two cases before the Supreme Court of the United States this question has been decided. One of these cases is the case of *Loughborough vs. Blake*, to be found in 5 *Wheaton*, which was a tax case. It involved direct taxation by the United States, and the question arose whether or not a district of the United States was a State in that sense and in the Union in that sense that the direct-tax provision of the Constitution applied to it. Chief Justice Marshall said that it was held that uniformity of tax law applying as to other States applied to the District of Columbia, and that the State of the District of Columbia or the Territories west of the Missouri River were just as much a part of the United States in the sense of the Constitution as any State in the Union.

Another was the case in 16 *Howard*. It is the case of *Cross et al. vs. Harrison*, in which the question of tariff laws as applicable to California arose. In that case the Supreme Court showed the difference between military occupancy and sovereignty. It showed

that during the military occupancy the military commander, under the President of the United States, might prescribe such duties as he saw fit. That was under the right of the strong hand, a de facto government, the only government that was there; but the moment that civil power supervened and cession took place, it became the duty of Congress to establish a collection district in California, and the moment that it established the agency for the collection of revenue, uniform and equal laws attached as to every other port and every other place in the United States.

Let us not deceive ourselves about this treaty. Let us not try to deceive any portion of the American people about this treaty. If we are going to take the Philippine Islands, and if a treaty is to be enacted, let us contemplate beforehand exactly what it means, and assume and honorably bear its inevitable consequences. It means the utter destruction of all tariff laws if Congress shall do its duty between the Filipinos and us; it means the utter abrogation of all immigration laws between the Filipinos and us, and the Chinese, the Japanese, the Tagalos, the Negritos, and all the curious and nondescript tribes of the Philippines, with all that they produce in those islands, and with all that their cheap labor may manufacture in those islands, established by greed and foreordained by this treaty to come into the market places and the marts of the United States on exactly the same basis, under the same protection, and with all the benefits which accrue to all American workmen of any race, of any State, or of any Territory.

I would add to the decisions which I have read a few more, which I deem it scarce necessary to read, but I will add to the authorities which I have quoted one from Cooley on the Constitution, a decision of

Judge Washington in 4 Washington Circuit Court Reports, which is generally accepted and taken by text writers and jurists as an exposition of what is meant by the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States. He says:

They may all be comprehended under the following general heads: Protection of the Government; the enjoying of life and liberty; the right to acquire and possess property of every kind and to pursue and obtain happiness in safety, subject nevertheless to such restraints as the Government may justly prescribe for the general good of the whole; the right of the citizen of one State to pass through or to reside in another State for the purposes of trade, agriculture, professional pursuits, or otherwise; to claim the benefit of the writ of habeas corpus; to institute and maintain actions of every kind in the courts of the States; to take, hold, and dispose of property, either real or personal; an exemption from higher taxes or imposts than are paid by the citizens of the other States may be mentioned as some of the particular privileges and immunities of citizens which are clearly expressed by the general description of privileges deemed to be fundamental.

It is true that this treaty reserves the right of Congress to declare the civil rights and political status of these people; but it is also true that Congress in declaring those civil rights and that political status is bound by the Constitution to recognize these fundamental rights, immunities, and privileges, and it can make no definition of civil rights, it can make no declaration of political status, that is not within the lines of that Constitution and of these limitations as they have been recognized and expounded.

To recur now to the statute, Congress has already legislated upon this subject. It has provided in anticipation what shall be the rights and what are the rights of the occupants and inhabitants of our territory; and I read these sections:

Sec. 1977. All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and to no other.

There is one section applicable to personal rights.
Now the next section:

Sec. 1978. All citizens of the United States shall have the same right, in every State and Territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property.

Then there is still another section :

Sec. 1979. Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress.

Here, then, Congress has already by anticipation fixed its policy as to citizens. It has already put the Filipino upon the plane of any other American citizen. It has already interpreted the clauses of the Constitution which operate upon it, and the very moment that the assent of the Senate of the United States goes to the treaty, the moment the bars are down, the gates are opened and the Filipino walks under the protection of that statute and can say, if he will, as proudly as any of us, "I, too, am an American citizen, and claim the right of the road and the freedom of the mart and all the privileges, rights, and immunities which attach to me as such."

Now, if we are to have these people, let us have a little understanding of whom they are. We do not know much. I know, probably, as little as any, but I have tried to find out by hasty perusal of encyclopedias, magazines, newspaper articles, etc.—

If that statute did not exist ready-made, applying to the Filipinos *eo instanti*, we would be obliged by the Constitution immediately to make it. Instead of acquiring by the treaty any suggestion or right to repeal it, we would come under the most solemn adjuration that man can live under to enact it.

Would any benefit of trade compensate us for this great change in our national life and this organic change in our institutions? If there be any underly-

ing incentive that has not been fully exploited with respect to this treaty, it must be that we are going to get some trade benefit from it. We will get a place to build railroads, perhaps, though there are a great many good openings for railroads yet remaining in this country. We will have an enlarged market for our wares, it may be suggested. On this line I beg to read a line from a pamphlet called "The Colonial Systems of the World," which has just been issued by our own Government, compiled by Mr. O. P. Austin:

Commerce between the successful colonies and their mother countries is in nearly all cases placed upon practically the same basis as that with other countries, goods from the home countries receiving in the vast majority of cases no advantages over those from other countries in import duties or other exactions of this character affecting commerce. In the more prosperous and progressive colonies, the percentage of importations from the mother countries grows somewhat less as the business and prosperity increase.

The chief British colonies in North America (Canada and Newfoundland), which in 1871 took 50 per cent of their importations from the home country, took in 1896 less than 30 per cent from the United Kingdom; those of South Africa (Cape Colony and Natal), which in 1871 took 83 per cent from the home country, took but 71 per cent in 1896; those of Australia and the adjacent islands, which in 1876 took 48 per cent from the home country, in 1896 took but 40 per cent. The French colonies now take from the home country about 42 per cent of their total imports, while the British colonies obtain about 40 per cent of their total imports from the home country.

This shows that the exploitation of colonies for the purpose of monopolizing trade is a vanishing quantity in the civilization of the world; and in the last two or three decades even, in the colonies of Great Britain and France, which those great nations have cultivated and tried to build up as subsidiary to their home markets, the proportion of goods that they have bought from the mother country has been a constantly diminishing quantity. So I say, under the conditions which we at present find the colonizing exploitation schemes of the world's aggressive aggrandizement, they are not in that attitude to tempt us to go there for the purposes of trade.

There is another fact with respect to our own trade which is equally significant as indicative of what

should be our true policy. It is not necessary to own a man in order to sell something to him. It may be very convenient to catch a fellow and tie him down, to build a tariff fortification on one side and an internal revenue fortification on the other, and then say, "Buy this and give me that." It is a scheme which is outworked in the world's progress. It is no longer necessary to buy a man and tie him and hold him and compel him to trade with you. Neither is it necessary to exercise suzerainty after Turkish or Spanish or English or any other fashion in order to trade with people.

With whom to-day is our largest and most profitable trade? From whom do we derive the largest balance that goes into our coffers? From whom do we receive the largest sums for our agricultural products or for our many articles of manufacture which are now possessing the earth, not by colonization, not by the sovereignty of our Government, but which are now conquering the earth and subduing nations to pay tribute to us through the excellence of American workingmen and the cheapness of American products, brought forth by skilled labor, challenging the world to competition? It is Great Britain. She is our first benefactor in the way of trade.

Yet, strange to say, we have not a single strategic island at the mouth of Liverpool Harbor. We have not built a single American castle, after the pattern of Morro, upon the bank of the Thames. At Portsmouth and Southampton and Dover, and at all the other ports of England, our flag comes and goes, and the merchantmen deliver our goods and bring back what we want, and there is no American soldier there, there is no American gun there, there is no Philippine Island there, there is no Hawaiian Island there, there

is nothing there except the superiority of American goods and the Englishman with his money who wants to buy them.

The time has passed in the history of the world when you have to blow your way to trade by dynamite. The time has passed in the history of the world, even in China, when you can build Chinese walls around nations. They say we want to go to the Philippines to open the door of the East. That is progress. Yet others say that when we get in the Philippines to open the door of the East they want to trim down the Declaration of Independence.

They want to viscerate the Constitution of the United States; they want to revise and correct the judicial decisions of Marshall and Taney; they want to upset the Supreme Court, and they want to repeal the free statutes of an American Congress, so as to shut the door behind the Philippines and build an inner wall to keep them from communicating and trading with us. To this complexion we have come at last, so incongruous, so heterogeneous, so contradictory of all we have been and all that we ought to be. We are breaking down our history, repudiating and belittling our principles, and seeking to subvert the whole theory and settled tenure of American progress and of American rule, just to get and embody in our Commonwealth some scattered, barbarous, or savage islands and people of a mixed and nondescript race.

I desire to insert here from the Democratic Magazine for January, 1899, a summary of who these new Americans are. It is a compilation summarized from the books and papers which have recently been written upon the subject. In the first place, we are to have 25,000 Negritos, aborigines. They have no fixed occupation. They are American citizens, or will be, out

of a job, but ready for one. They are dwarfish as a rule, 4 feet 8 inches in average height; negroid features, hair, and color; tattooed; nearly naked. Their religion is pagan.

In the next place, we have 3,000,000 Tagals and 2,500,000 Visayos. They are Catholic. They are field hands, day laborers, servants, agriculturists, small traders. They are tall and well formed, round head, flat nose, low brow, large dark eyes.

Then we have the Moros, of whom there are 300,000. They are Mohammedans. They are agriculturists, hunters, and fishers, and our noble cod is in danger, for they will fish and fish and their fish will come here in competition with our fish. They are tall and strong, scantily clothed, rather savage-featured.

Then come the Igorrotes. They are pagan. There are 500,000 of them. They live in the mountainous districts. They are dirty and repulsive in appearance, industrious, monogamists, distinct from Malays and Negritos. They are probably of Japanese origin. Then come scattered tribes, 2,000,000, mixed (pagan, Catholic, Mohammedan) altogether. They are found throughout the archipelago. They are hunters, fishers, small agriculturists; varying, some closely resembling Negritos, others equal to Tagals.

Then we have the Spanish, 10,000. Three hundred years of colonization and only 10,000 Spaniards there! How long would it be before there are 10,000 Americans there? There are only a handful now. There are only 200 Englishmen in the city of Manila. The people of our race only touch at the Philippine Islands, and it is touch and go. They stop to have a transaction or to direct a transaction, and as one of our Eastern States was said to be a most excellent State to emigrate from, the Philippine Islands are considered

by all civilized nations whose people have ever been there as a most excellent place to get away from, and as quickly as possible, and they have all got away from there. Even to-day, after three hundred years of occupation, only 10,000 Spaniards have located there.

Then come the Spanish Mestizos, descendants of Spanish fathers and native mothers, 50,000, Catholic. Then come the Chinese, 200,000, Buddhists. They are in every city and town. John Chinaman is everywhere, with his cheap laundry and his cheap transactions in various things. In every city and town he is located. They are merchants, tradesmen, laborers. Every community of any size has its Chinese quota. They are hated by Spaniards and heavily taxed, but they are industrious and prosperous.

Then come the Chinese Mestizos, or mixed breed, 400,000; double the number of the pure and genuine article. They are Buddhists and Catholics. They are in all important communities. There are merchants, tradesmen, dock hands, and laborers.

Then come other nationalities. Under the colonization of Spain, in three hundred years all the other nationalities of these islands, containing some eight or ten million people, amount to only 5,000.

The statement referred to is as follows:

[From the Democratic Magazine for January, 1899.]

INHABITANTS OF THE PHILIPPINES; THE MANY AND MIXED RACES OCCUPYING OUR NEW POSSESSIONS IN THE EAST.

NATIVES.

Negritos (Aetas) aborigines, 25,000, Pagan. Scattered throughout archipelago. No fixed occupation. Dwarfish (4 ft. 8 in. av.). Negroid features, hair, and color; tattooed; nearly naked. Roving bands, subsisting on honey, wild fruits, and roots. Driven to the more inaccessible regions by invading Malays.

Malays: Indonesians-Tagals, 3,000,000, Catholic. Northern and central islands of archipelago. Field hands, day laborers, servants, agriculturists. Tall and well-formed; round head, flat nose, low brow; large, dark eyes. By preference inhabit the lowlands, many

living in pile-bullt dwellings; easily civilized, musical, lazy and superstitious.

Visayos, 2,500,000, Catholic. Southern islands, save Sulu and Mindanao. Agriculturists, laborers, servants, and small traders. Well developed; regular but somewhat Negroid features. Peaceful, very lazy, vain, fond of fine clothes, cigarettes, and betel nuts; tractable.

Moros, 300,000, Mohammedan. Inland portions of large islands. Agriculturists, hunters and fishers. Tall and strong; scantily clothed; rather savage featured. This class embraces all Malays not civilized and converted to Christianity. Similar to Tagals.

Igorrotes (Igolotes), 500,000, Pagan. Mountainous districts, mostly in Luzon. Agriculturists, miners, and metal workers. Dirty and repulsive in appearance. Most industrious and moral of the native tribes, monogamists; known to be distinct from Malays and Negritos. Probably of Japanese origin.

Scattered tribes, 2,000,000, mixed (Pagan, Catholic, Mohammedan). Throughout archipelago. Hunters, fishers, and small agriculturists. Varying, some closely resembling Negritos, others equal to Tagals. Over sixty dialects among natives. Over thirty languages officially recognized. About 200 tribes in archipelago.

NON-NATIVES.

Spanish, 10,000, Catholic. Mostly in large cities. State, church, and military officials, army and navy. There are few Spaniards in the island outside of army, navy, and church.

Spanish-Mestizos, 50,000, Catholic. Mostly in large cities. Merchants, petty officials. Descendants of Spanish fathers and native mothers.

Chinese, 200,000, Buddhist. In every city and town. Merchants, tradesmen, and laborers. Every community of any size has its Chinese quota. They are hated by Spaniards and heavily taxed. Industrious, prosperous.

Chinese-Mestizos, 400,000, Buddhist and Catholic. In all important communities. Merchants, tradesmen, dock hands, and laborers. Descendants from Chinese fathers and native mothers. Make good business men.

Other nationalities, 5,000, in cities of Manila, Iloilo, and Cebu. Wholesale merchants and traders. Mostly English, German, French, and American. They monopolize wholesale trade.

We are asked to annex to the United States a witch's caldron—

Black spirits and white, red spirits and gray,
Mingle, mingle, mingle, you that mingle may.


We are not only asked to annex the caldron and make it a part of our great, broad, Christian, Anglo-Saxon, American land, but we are asked also to annex the contents and take this brew—mixed races, Chinese, Japanese, Malay Negritos—anybody who has come along in three hundred years, in all of their concatenations and colors; and the travelers who have been there tell us and have written in the books that they are not only of all hues and colors, but there are spotted people there, and, what I have never heard of

in any other country, there are striped people there with zebra signs upon them.

This mess of Asiatic pottage, 7,000 miles from the United States, in a land that we can not colonize and can not inhabit, we are told to-day by the fortune of a righteous war waged for liberty, for the ascendancy of the Declaration of Independence, for the gift of freedom to an adjoining State, we must take up and annex and combine with our own blood and with our own people, and consecrate them with the oil of American citizenship.

There has never been since time began such a fatuous notion in the breast of a nation. There has never been such condescension from a high ideal and from a noble and manifest destiny. Not only is it a degradation of this American land and of this American race, but the scholars and thinkers of this country, the mighty men who ponder institutions and courses of events, look upon our adoption of these people and our forcible annexation of them as giving the lie to the whole current of American history and repudiating all the great principles of constitutional freedom which we proclaimed at our beginning and which have tended to make us great.

I have no criticism to pronounce upon my colleagues who differ with me. I have no reproaches for those who see their duty differently. I believe the gentlemen who represented our country in Paris acted honestly and conscientiously. I believe the honorable gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber mean only their country's good; but I am amazed, I am startled, I am thrown away from my ordinary bearings and conception of things to think that such gentlemen and such a body should contemplate the adoption of a treaty that utterly scorns and repudiates our



G. G. Vest



George F. Howe

position; that is essentially at war with our institutions; that embodies a country which is no part of the American continent and can not be made so, and that must inevitably take up and work into the destiny of the American people these alien races, or must make us get down from the throne of freedom which we have occupied for one hundred and twenty-five years and condescend with the scrambling nations of the world to get what we can, where we can, and how we can, to the repudiation of our national character and of our settled doctrines and principles.

I wish to read a few words from Professor Sumner. That he is learned and able no man will deny. That he is profound and thoughtful all men know. This is the light in which he regards the treaty:

The question of imperialism, then, is the question whether we are going to give the lie to the origin of our own national existence by establishing a colonial system of the old Spanish type, even if we have to sacrifice our existing civil and political system to do it. I submit that it is a strange incongruity to utter grand platitudes about the blessings of liberty, etc., which we are going to impart to these people and to begin by refusing to extend the Constitution over them, and still more by throwing the Constitution into the gutter here at home. If you take away the Constitution, what is the American liberty and all the rest? Nothing but a lot of phrases.

And this indeed we have been plainly told here, when the great doctrines of our freedom were quoted, was a lot of phrases, and gentlemen are going to hew out a new path and make new principles upon the mimicry and policy of Great Britain and find their path where they may according to the chance medley of things. There is yet another sentence or two from Professor Sumner which I wish to read:

The cold and unnecessary cruelty of the Spaniards to the aborigines is appalling, even when compared with the treatment of the aborigines by other Europeans. A modern economist stands aghast at the economic measures adopted by Spain, as well in regard to her domestic policy as to her colonies. It seems as if those measures could only have been inspired by some demon of folly, they were so destructive to her prosperity. She possesses a large literature from the last three centuries, in which her publicists discuss with amazement the question whether it was a blessing or a curse to get the Indies, and why, with all the supposed conditions of prosperity in her hands, she was declining all the time.

We now hear it argued that she is well rid of her colonies, and

that, if she will devote her energies to her internal development, and rid her politics of the corruption of colonial officials and interests, she may be regenerated. That is a rational opinion. It is the best diagnosis of her condition, and the best prescription of a remedy which the occasion has called forth. But what, then, will happen to the state which has taken over her colonies? I can see no answer except that that nation, with them, has taken over the disease, and that it now is to be corrupted by exploiting dependent communities just as she has been. That it stands exposed to this danger is undeniable.

It was the wisest of men who said, "The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be * * * and there is no new thing under the sun." But, sir, not until the hour that this treaty was debated in this chamber did the idea come to my mind that it was the destiny of this great American Republic to put on the old clothes of Spain and to take those shining feet which have walked across the heights of freedom and put on them the worn-out shoes of Spain. We have dispossessed her here by our shores of the land which she despised and destroyed, and which she did not lift up, but which pulled her down to its low level. We can not make American citizens of the Filipinos with such conceptions of citizenship as we possess.

Not in a hundred years, nay, not in a thousand years, can we lift the Philippine Islands and the mixed races that there inhabit to the level of civilization which this land, God-blessed, possesses. It is easier to let down and to go down than to rise up. We have risen up through the bloody sweat and turmoil of a thousand years of battle and through bitter experiences which have chastened us. *Facilis descensus Averno*. The moment that this treaty is ratified, in some future age, if such shall be the case, the historian will say at that moment commenced the decline of American institutions and of the great career which America had set forth to herself to lead upon this earth.

Any way you go, this Republic will stand; this

people will live for hundreds and a thousand of years to come; but I wish that the longevity of this nation might transcend anything that ever had happened before in all the story of time. I would wish that the Declaration of Independence, instead of being belittled, might be carried nearer and closer home to every hearth and hearthstone in all this land; that it might go to the lowly and humble of whatever skin or complexion with the outstretched hand of friendship and with a message of God's love.

I would wish that all might be exalted. But whatever happens, let us not go down. We stand to-day by the bank of a broader and a deeper Rubicon than ever Cæsar meditated beside. At our feet we hear the swash of the great Pacific Ocean, and beyond lies the expansionists' dream—Cæsar's Rome. Cæsar never did wrong without just cause. That is the imperialistic plea. America will not do wrong without a great temptation. That to-day is the expansionists' plea. For my country I hope that she will ne'er do wrong.

Let no glittering temptation of trade, let no gold from the gorgeous East tempt her eye or her hand. She stands to-day the foremost nation of the world. She stands to-day the foremost nation that ever the world has seen. Let her tread with secure and steady steps along her own highways, respecting nations and respecting men, putting into the dream of every child that goes to school that vision of liberty of which the Declaration is the great figure and of which the Constitution is the rock-bound formation. Let her to the tempter of expansion to-day say, as He said who stood upon the mount when the glories of the earth were stretched before Him, "Get thee behind me, Satan."

Peace! Peace! This treaty is not a treaty of peace except in formal ceremony with Spain. It is a declaration of war against the Philippine people, not by Congress, but in necessary and logical effect. We know that the Filipinos are in arms. We know that they have an army of from 12,000 to 30,000. We know that they are seeking to work out their own destiny. The moment that this treaty is adopted the Filipinos are made citizens, and the moment they are made citizens, if they do not instantly lay down their arms they become rebels. The tie of allegiance is created with this Government, and when the President or Commander-in-Chief says, "Our sovereignty is here; lay down your arms," they bear them no longer, under the penalty of death.

My country—may she ever be right; but my country, right or wrong. That is my doctrine. If the treaty is passed, I believe it is constitutional and authoritative. I do not deny the legal or constitutional right. I accept the fate and the decree of my country, and I stand with my people and my kind. At the same time I know what it means. I would that this cup might pass from us. There is a line of battle in the Philippine Islands of a dusky race, who have reared a flag and who have asked that they might be free. The moment this treaty passes, if they do not lay down their arms, it is the duty of the American President to order it, and it is the duty of the American soldier to shoot them to death and to make them lay down their arms under the penalty of execution in battle.

I hope that may not happen. I pray it may not happen. But, oh, if it should happen, what a conclusion is that of a holy and a righteous war begun

for humanity and for liberty, and what justification has this nation before God and man?

The peace of the world! is it going to conduce to the permanent peace of the world to have the forefinger of America dipped into Asiatic politics? I much question it. Lord Salisbury, in that recent memorable speech, which all Senators have noted, declared that it was his opinion that it would help England, but as to the peace of the world, he could not see that it was any assurance of that.

We know that China is in many respects a dying nation. We know that Japan, Russia, France, Germany, and Great Britain, every great nation of the world, is watching China and is trying to get certain advantages there.

If we take the Philippine Islands we put ourselves right there by the gate of war. We announce by taking it that we intend to take the line up there—to follow the flag. The line is far distant. It can not march there; it has got to sail there. It has got to sail 7,000 miles there over tropical seas, around the world in one direction or another. But if it must go, it will go and it will stay. But will that conduce to the world's peace?

The next thing in order to maintain ourselves we must have an ally. We will feel lonesome out there, perhaps, by ourselves. An alliance with some great nation is the next inevitable consequence of this treaty. That nation may be Great Britain.

I rejoice that there have been two great moral effects of our war with Spain. In the first place, more than over any other result do I rejoice that it has made all Americans brethren in verity. If there were wrongs committed, if there were mistakes made, if there were errors for whom our fathers or ourselves

were accountable thirty or forty years ago, thank God it has been wiped out in the blood of our sons. Northern and Southern men, Eastern and Western men, have baptized this nation anew with their blood under the flag.

Next to that, I rejoice that the whole English-speaking race has been brought in closer affinity. I am glad that our motherland and the people of the United States have been brought together in the manner that they ought to be brought together, by their natural relations, by the affinity of blood, and that congenial and friendly feelings exist. But no bond of alliance has been made between them. We have tied ourselves up in no legal or constitutional engagement. Friendship has grown, as it must ever grow, without sealing wax and without parchment.

But if we maintain our position in the East, an alliance is necessary. It will soon come. The first rumor of war that startles our business men and that wakes America to anxiety will throw us into the arms of an alliance of some sort or another with somebody. What does that alliance with one person mean? It means the rest of the world against us. There will be alliances against the alliance. The moment that an alliance is made, then instead of having one chance for war we have two.

If we expect our ally to fight for us, we stand ready at a moment's warning to fight for it. It takes two to make a bargain. Each must be faithful to it. Then, perhaps, we will put a third in the alliance. Then three must stand together or fall together, and around that maelstrom just beginning to eddy on the Asiatic shore; having first pulled American sovereignty out of its natural socket between the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans, floating in the eddying waters

of the tropical seas, it will bring an alliance there and an alliance against it; and around that standpoint some day will be fought a great battle for some nation in which America and her institutions will be imperiled.

It is the unexpected that happens in such adventures, as it is the unexpected that happens in war. In this way or in some other way such is the tendency of things; some collision of some sort at some time is inevitable.

Now, what are our alternatives? The junior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Lodge) said a few days ago that we have the alternative of ratifying the treaty or rejecting it. He portrayed great difficulties from its rejection. If it is ratified, he said, we will look out for our policies afterwards.

The senior Senator from Ohio (Mr. Foraker) on the 11th of January gave considerable consideration to our alternative, and I will read what he said, because I wish to quote more accurately:

I know whereof I speak—

He said—

when I say that of the four things we had the choice of doing—giving the islands back to Spain, giving them to other countries, leaving them to anarchy, or taking them ourselves—the President acted most wisely when he concluded that we should take them ourselves.

The honorable Senator's analysis of the situation and statement of the alternatives presented to us was complete with a single striking and important exception. He omitted a fifth alternative, or, rather, a differentiation of the fourth. We might take them to ourselves as a sovereign accepting the perpetual sovereignty of them, and thus incorporating them *eo instanti* as a part of us—as we did with Porto Rico, or we might simply have required Spain to relinquish her sovereignty, and have continued our military

occupation, which is a mere temporary assertion of the strong hand, and left the question of sovereignty and final disposition for future determination.

It is this fifth alternation, an easy and safe and ready and expedient course, which I do most cordially commend. The speech of the Senator from Ohio furnishes itself the reasons why this alternative, as it seems to me, is the wisest one to be pursued. He says:

I do not know of anybody who wants to take possession of the Philippine Islands and govern the people of those islands indefinitely by force of arms.

Secondly:

I say I do not know of anybody from the President of the United States down to his humblest follower in this matter who is proposing by force and violence to take and hold these islands for all time to come.

Then, if we are not ready by force and violence to take them if they resist, if we are not ready to follow our sovereignty by the necessary and inevitable corollary of sovereignty, why do that thing which commits us to it? Why accept or assert "sovereignty" there which in its nature contemplates all time to come, and which predicates of itself indefinite, aye, infinite extension?

Why, he says, "there are complications." He justly refrained from motives of prudence and delicacy, which I respect and follow, from stating them. But I will add, however, that my motives have the additional one of ignorance.

But whatever those complications may be, there is none imaginable that could not be dealt with from the standpoint of military occupation, which is transient, momentary, and ambulatory sovereignty without committal as to its prolongation, as by an acceptance of title and sovereignty which is the lordship of the land and of its population forever.

It is for that proposition that I stand. We have the formula of it in the treaty itself with respect to Cuba. That it is acceptable to Spain when we ask it is shown by the fact that where we asked it she adopted it. There is no difficulty in the meantime.

The honorable Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Spooner], who addressed us so ably and candidly on yesterday, said there was no difficulty about our protocol and about our having captured Manila. I have read that protocol. It solves instead of suggesting difficulty, for by its own terms provides that until by treaty we have settled this matter we are to remain in possession of the stronghold of the situation. So we will not stay there as an intruder. We stay there by consent of Spain, and she herself has provided in that protocol the very situation which we would most desire and most comfortably occupy for a waiting period.

So then I say, from the standpoint of that protocol, by Spanish consent occupying the bay and harbor of Manila, exercising our good offices as far as we may to get her prisoners released from the insurgent Filipinos, going on and fulfilling all the details of the protocol with Spain in sending her soldiers back to their native land, there awaits her but one thing, to leave America free from Filipino annexation, in occupation of the theater of the war and in such a condition that honorably, reasonably, she may do henceforth without embarrassment that which seemeth unto her good as a free people.

There are two great leaders of political parties in the United States whose names will never be forgotten, and who, however great may be those who will take their places hereafter, will never be transcended in the hold that they have upon the affec-

tions of the common people of this country. It is fortunate for the country and fortunate for both parties that it is so.

One of those men was Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, the great annexationist of American territory, the man who from the beginning repudiated all annexations of territory ultra mare. The other one of those great leaders was Abraham Lincoln; and, singularly enough and fortunately enough in the contemplation of the great subject which we have before us to-day, Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln stand for the same doctrine, and the two parties are made into one stream flowing into the great constitutional channel of American liberty.

Both of these men, more than any men of their day and generation, had confidence in and trusted the common people. Each of them believed that every individual had rights which all men were bound to respect; and if Thomas Jefferson was the author of the Declaration, Abraham Lincoln carried that Declaration severely, exactly, and strictly to its logical and essential consequences. We have just got through that work with the loss of much blood and treasure, and to each gentleman who to-day may hesitate upon this subject, be he a Democrat, I would say: "My friend, follow the teaching and the inspiration of Jefferson;" and, if he be a Republican, "I invoke the spirit and teaching of Abraham Lincoln."

There be those who see an American scepter in the eastern sky. It may be that that scepter is there; but if that scepter be there, it is not a scepter that sparkles by the side of the star that shone over the manger of Bethlehem when the shepherds watched their flocks

at night and when the wise men, looking for the Messiah, came.

No; I would rather invoke to-day that star which hovered over old Independence Hall on the morning of that 4th of July, 1776, when the world waited the deliverance of a mighty message; I would point to that star, the star of the great northern Republic, founded by the great white race of the northern nations; I would say we go on no war of conquest; I would say that we respect the weakest and the most helpless of mankind; I would say to the men who are fighting for their freedom, be they many or be they few, be they in Cuba or be they in the Philippine Islands, that to them the great American Republic gives the salute of honor and dares not condescend to put her foot upon their necks.

I would point again to that bright star that beamed over Independence Hall in the bright morning of our birthright, and I would hope that ever hereafter we might say of it that of its—

* * * true-fix'd and resting quality
There is no fellow in the firmament.

CHAPTER XVII.

ARE WE TO SPREAD THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION WITH THE BAYONET POINT AS MAHOMET SPREAD ISLAMISM WITH A SCIMITER?

BY HON. BENJAMIN R. TILLMAN,

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA.

I have listened to the long and able debate on the general proposition of annexation or expansion, and have never at any time intended to obtrude my views.

I have never in my legislative experience in this body or in any other assemblage heard so many speeches giving the most cogent reasons why a man should not vote for a proposition followed by the acknowledgment that the speaker notwithstanding intended to give his vote in its support. So at least a great many votes that have gone to the treaty and have enabled it to become the law of the land have been cast by men who have been in great doubt as to their duty and have at last yielded rather to pressure than to any conscientious or calm consideration of the result.

As far as my observation goes, and as I understand the present status of the American people, we have no Constitution left. The only rule which governs Congress now is the rule of the majority. We had an illustration of that when the Hawaiian treaty was rejected by the constitutional one-third, more than one-third refusing to ratify it, and the majority

brought in its resolution of annexation by which the Constitution was overridden.

I will qualify the statement I have just made as regards our having no Constitution left, which the majority are bound to respect, by saying that the two-thirds vote to ratify a treaty is the only scintilla of the original instrument which now remains to hamper the majority.

If the Senate joint Resolution should pass and be approved by the President it would mean nothing more than the cold-blooded enunciation of our power, and a declaration that we will deal with this question from the standpoint of our interests, regardless of the rights or the wishes of those 10,000,000 Asiatics who have come under our sway. And above all, notwithstanding the assertions which we heard here yesterday, that we could not take time to enter into negotiations with the men who had pistols at our breasts, or with those who had fired upon the flag, it appears to me that of all times in our history we could at this moment give forth a sound that would be generous and worthy of the great American people.

What caused this last battle of Manila? The reports which we receive through our newspapers all come from American sources; they charge that the Filipinos wantonly attacked the American army, and that that army had a right to defend itself, which nobody assumes to deny. But when we recollect that the telegraph lines from those islands are in charge of the American commander there, or of those whom he designates to control them, it is natural for us to suppose that nothing would be let out under the censorship which has existed for the last three months or more that would be in the slightest degree derogatory to the good faith or the honor of the American

army there. Time alone will tell whether this battle was provoked by the Filipinos for purposes of their own or by the Americans for the purpose of endeavoring to sway men in this Senate to ratify the treaty and change the status.

I recall one of Æsop's fables in which a painter had depicted a lion lying on his back prone beneath the heel of a man, and when he showed the painting to the lion the lion said, "Yes, you painted that; but if you will let me paint it, the situation will be just the opposite."

I come now to make a statement, upon which I base what I have just said, to this effect: That I have seen in the last forty-eight hours an invalided officer of the American Army, one of the regulars, who has just reached this city from Manila. From what he told me of the situation before he left there, I dare to assert that the American Army has been in a state of siege in that city for three or four months; that the lines surrounding the city have been in the possession of the Filipino army outside; that no American was allowed to cross them; and that those Filipinos, while they had not been actively engaged in firing upon our troops, have preserved a strict recognition of the fact that they were in an attitude of antagonism, that they did not recognize this Government as having any rights outside of the city of Manila. If that be true, the question recurs as to who may be responsible or who was responsible for the battle of Saturday night last.

As I understand the legal status the ratification of the treaty will bring about this result: That in the eye of the law the Philippine Islands are ours and the inhabitants thereof are to-day rebels; they are now ours by right of cession from Spain, ratified yesterday

by this body, and to be ratified soon by the Spanish Government; they are Americans, and since they have fired upon the flag they are rebels. That is the law of the situation as we see it and possibly as the world sees it.

Now, considering the fact, which can not be denied—for our consul reported the fact as far back as February, 1898, before Dewey sailed into Manila Bay—that there was a rebellion against Spain; that the Filipino army was lying outside of the city of Manila and hostilities were active; considering the fact that they organized a government as far back as last June; considering the fact that they have been actively engaged in collecting munitions of war and have recruited their army until, as this officer told me, they have not less than 40,000 men outside of Manila today, we are brought face to face with the consideration as to whether it was not wise and proper and the best thing from their point of view for the Filipinos to make the attack which they did, or which it is said they did, on Saturday night last.

If they went to war with the United States before the United States had a title to those islands in law, what is their legal status in international law? They can not be called rebels to us except from the extreme standpoint of legal technicality. We had no right in Manila so far as they were concerned; we only had rights there so far as Spain was concerned; and if, after they had their representative here pleading and begging for some word of comfort, some promise as to our policy, or some dim outline even as to the purpose of recognizing their right to local self-government, they grew desperate at last and fired upon our troops, the firing upon those troops before we had any legal title must give them the right of belligerents

in war, although they are subjects of Spain, because by the cession to us we simply fall heir to Spain's residuary title in those islands.

We may say they are rebels, and in strict legal interpretation they may be rebels, but let this war terminate how it will, history will declare that they are to-day patriots striving for what we fought for in our struggle with Great Britain in the last century; and we can not escape from the condition at least of doubt as to the course we ought to follow when we consider this fact. They were fighting for their freedom against Spanish tyranny two years ago, and they continued to fight up to the time when Aguinaldo left the islands and went to Singapore; they continued the fight, as our own consul said, after he left; they never did cease, some of them; there never was peace; and now the question which addresses itself to every American who loves his flag and loves his great country and loves the great principle upon which that flag rests and that country is founded is this: Are we to take the place of Spain as their taskmasters and tyrants?

I have looked back down the vista of what history I have read, and I appeal to any Senator here who may be versed in history to correct me if I am wrong when I say there never has been in the history of time a precedent for the existing condition now at Manila between the United States and the Filipino insurgents. The transition or transfer of the legal title to the islands during the period of their rebellion against one government and their effort to throw off the yoke and establish an independent government has never, so far as I recall, occurred before in the history of the world.

I say the present situation in Manila is unique,

it is *sui generis*, it is the first one of the kind that has ever existed in the history of the world where a colony of another nation at war with that nation for its freedom has been sold in the meantime to another power and their allegiance or sovereignty transferred.

We can look at it from our side and then look at it from theirs. I have just presented a few of the ideas which have occurred to me as having actuated the Filipinos in firing upon the American flag, as they did last Saturday, and that was that they desired to obtain in the eye of international law the rights of belligerents and not become rebels after the cession, as would have occurred if they had fired yesterday evening or this morning, after we had ratified the treaty.

Senators will recall the fact that some twenty years ago the South African Republic, known as the Transvaal, inhabited by the Boers, was annexed to the British Crown by proclamation. A British diplomatic agent had gone into that country to spy out the land, so to speak, to feel the temper of the people. Having notified his Government that it was advisable to do so, a proclamation was issued, simply reaching out and swallowing the whole Republic, putting them under the British flag, and sending a British governor, accompanied by a regiment of soldiers, to take possession of the cities, towns, and forts, and lo, the thing was done; the Transvaal was a part of the British Empire!

The Boers, a sturdy Dutch stock, who had fled from Natal and from the Orange Free State to get rid of the Englishmen, numbering only about 50,000 souls all told, met in mass meeting and in assembly time and again. They protested, they supplicated,

they negotiated, they begged. In the meantime, while these proceedings were going on, there was a transfer of power in England from the wily, brilliant, but unscrupulous Disraeli to that grandest of English statesmen of this century, William Ewart Gladstone. But even Mr. Gladstone, though he felt that the incorporation of the Boers under the British flag and into the British Empire was wrong, did not feel called upon to say so officially; and in the Queen's address to the Commons, written, of course, by the prime minister, it was stated that their request could not be granted.

They were put under the British yoke in 1877. In December, 1880, three years afterwards, the machinery of the Government had begun to move, and the British tax-gatherer came around and levied on a wagon belonging to one of the Boers who had refused to pay taxes. He put it up for sale, but, instead of selling it, several Boers rode in on horseback, took charge of the wagon, and gave this British official notice to get out, and in a week's time the entire province was in rebellion against the British Crown, but struggling for that inherent right of man—self-government.

The British troops began to move; re-enforcements were rushed from Cape Town, from the adjoining territory belonging to England. The Boers were farmers who had never drilled, but the best riflemen in the world. The result was that in the conflicts with the British regulars these undrilled farmers whipped the redcoats, although they were officered by trained soldiers; and under the lead of one of their number, whose name was Joubert, they won some notable victories. Reading the history of his brilliant military deeds last night, I came to think that possibly

under similar conditions, extended a thousandfold as to this man Aguinaldo, who is now called an upstart and an organizer of a "tin-horn government" in Manila, in the Philippines, it may come to pass that under his inspiration and leadership a similar result will happen in those islands.

The last conflict between these Dutch farmers—half civilized if you choose to term them so—and the British army was at Majuba Hill, where a thousand picked British regulars had taken an impregnable position, as they thought, in the cup of an extinct volcano, a natural fortification with a rim around it. The Boers surrounded them, crawled up to the rim of the cup, and shot to death over half their number, put the rest to flight—those they did not capture—and "all the world wondered." Of course the British bulldog barked and the British lion roared. The demand from the rabble was, "Rush more re-enforcements down there and shoot those rebels to death."

What did Gladstone say and what did Gladstone do? Realizing that a continuation of the war involved the loss to Great Britain of many soldiers, realizing that his predecessor in office had committed a grave wrong, he sent a negotiator, Gen. Sir Evelyn Wood, with instructions to bring about an honorable peace by the restoration to those people of their republic, reserving only to the Queen of England the right of suzerain and the right to control the foreign policy of the republic.

What more do we want in the Philippines than the right of a protectorate, which will give us the control of their foreign policy, will keep away from those islands any outside interloper, or land-grabber, or robber who might desire to gobble them up and enslave the people? What right, or what advantage

will it be to us to do more than to get as to those islands a similar condition as that existing in the Transvaal?

When Parliament met, the leader of the opposition, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, moved a resolution censuring the Government for its disgraceful surrender to these struggling Boers in South Africa and the return to them of their inheritance of self-government. The English press—that portion of it which belonged to the opposition—clamored for punishment of the rebels and for their annihilation and extinction. Mr. Gladstone, in defending his conduct, made a speech in Parliament, an extract from which I shall read; and I would to God that it could be framed and hung up in every legislative chamber where the rights of man are discussed and passed on by legislators as a guide as to what true statesmanship demands. Here is what that great Englishman said:

“Our case is summed up in this: We have endeavored to cast aside all considerations of false shame, and we have felt that we were strong enough to put aside those considerations of false shame without fear of entailing upon our country any sacrifice at all. We have endeavored to do right, and to eschew wrong, and we have done that in a matter involving alike the lives of thousands and the honor and character of our country. And, sir, whatever may be the sense of gentlemen opposite, we believe that we are supported, not only by the general convictions of Parliament, but by those of the country. We feel that we are entitled to make that declaration, for from every great center of opinion in Europe, from the remotest corners of Anglo-Saxon America, have come back to us the echoes of the resolution which we have taken, the favoring and approving echoes, recognizing in the policy of the Government an ambition higher than that which looks for military triumph or for territorial aggrandizement, but which seeks to signalize itself by walking in the plain and simple ways of right and justice, and which desires never to build up empire except in the happiness of the governed.”

There is no parallel for the action of the English prime minister. He was the first who had the greatness of soul to rise up and do what was right regardless of consequences. Can the American nation, which we claim to be the home of liberty, a nation of free men, imbued with ideas of self-government from their cradle, can we do less?

It was said that English honor demanded that these colonists should be punished. Everybody knows that England could have sent troops enough there to have killed the last man of them, just as we can send troops enough to Manila to kill, as the Senator from Montana said the other day, "to shoot them to death," if need be, to make them respect our flag and our authority. We can do it. Nobody doubts that. The question is ought we to do it? Is it honorable to do it? Is it right to do it?

As though coming at the most opportune time possible, you might say just before the treaty reached the Senate, or about the time it was sent to us, there appeared in one of our magazines a poem by Rudyard Kipling, the greatest poet of England at this time. This poem, unique, and in some places too deep for me, is a prophecy. I do not imagine that in the history of human events any poet has ever felt inspired so clearly to portray our danger and our duty. It is called "The White Man's Burden." With the permission of Senators I will read a stanza, and I beg Senators to listen to it, for it is well worth their attention. This man has lived in the Indies. In fact, he is a citizen of the world, and has been all over it, and knows whereof he speaks.

"Take up the White Man's burden—
Send forth the best ye breed—
Go, bind your sons to exile,
To serve your captive's need;
To wait, in heavy harness,
On fluttered folk and wild—
Your new-caught sullen peoples,
Half devil and half child."

I will pause here. I intend to read more, but I wish to call attention to a fact which may have escaped the attention of Senators thus far, that with five exceptions every man in this Chamber who has had to do with the colored race in this country voted

against the ratification of the treaty. It was not because we are Democrats, but because we understand and realize what it is to have two races side by side that can not mix or mingle without deterioration and injury to both and the ultimate destruction of the civilization of the higher. We of the South have borne this white man's burden of a colored race in our midst since their emancipation and before.

It was a burden upon our manhood and our ideas of liberty before they were emancipated. It is still a burden, although they have been granted the franchise. It clings to us like the shirt of Nessus, and we are not responsible, because we inherited it, and your fathers as well as ours are responsible for the presence amongst us of that people. Why do we as a people want to incorporate into our citizenship ten millions more of different or of differing races, three or four of them?

But we have not incorporated them yet, and let us see what this English poet has to say about it, and what he thinks.

"Take up the White Man's burden—
No iron rule of kings,
But toil of serf and sweeper—
The tale of common things.
The ports ye shall not enter,
The roads ye shall not tread,
Go, make them with your living
And mark them with your dead."

Ah, if we have no other consideration, if no feeling of humanity, no love of our fellows, no regard for others' rights, if nothing but our self-interest shall actuate us in this crisis, let me say to you that if we go madly on in the direction of crushing these people into subjection and submission we will do so at the cost of many, many thousands of the flower of American youth. There are 10,000,000 of these people, some of them fairly well civilized, and running

to the extreme of naked savages, who are reported in our press dispatches as having stood out in the open and fired their bows and arrows, not flinching from the storm of shot and shell thrown into their midst by the American soldiers there.

The report of the battle claims that we lost only seventy-five killed and a hundred and odd wounded; but the first skirmish has carried with it what anguish, what desolation, to homes in a dozen States! How many more victims are we to offer up on this altar of Mammon or national greed? When those regiments march back, if they return with decimated ranks, as they are bound to come, if we have to send thousands and tens of thousands of re-enforcements there to press onward until we have subdued those ten millions, at whose door will lie these lives—their blood shed for what? An idea. If a man fires upon the American flag, shoot the last man and kill him, no matter how many Americans have to be shot to do it.

The city of Manila is surrounded by swamps and marshes, I am told. A few miles back lie the woods and jungles and mountains. These people are used to the climate. They know how to get about, and if they mean to have their liberties, as they appear to do, at what sacrifice will the American domination be placed over them? There is another verse of Kipling. I have fallen in love with this man. He tells us what we will reap:

"Take up the White Man's burden,
And reap his old reward—
The blame of those ye better,
The hate of those ye guard—
The cry of hosts ye humor
(Ah, slowly!) toward the light—
"Why brought ye us from bondage,
Our loved Egyptian night?" "

Those peoples are not suited to our institutions. They are not ready for liberty as we understand it,

They do not want it. Why are we bent on forcing upon them a civilization not suited to them and which only means in their view degradation and a loss of self-respect, which is worse than the loss of life itself?

I am nearly done. Nobody answers and nobody can. The commercial instinct which seeks to furnish a market and places for the growth of commerce or the investment of capital for the money making of the few is pressing this country madly to the final and ultimate annexation of these people regardless of their own wishes.

We are face to face with the question as to whether we will be content to pass a resolution here which might be sent to the Filipinos as a flag of truce and a means of bringing about pacification and ultimate relinquishment of everything except the protectorate and such commercial advantages as we ought to keep, and which they will gladly give us. We are at a crisis in our own history, when we must turn our faces away from this temptation, turn our backs upon the incentive which has led us thus far, or we must move forward remorselessly and relentlessly, doing our own country and our own people more harm than can result to those people, though we exterminate them from the face of the globe. We have within our grasp, and possible of attainment, a glory and honor such as has never come to another nation in the history of the world—the honor of having fought a war for the love of liberty, animated by no greedy, selfish purposes hidden under the declaration.

We are still an undegenerate people. We have not yet become corrupted. We have in our veins the best blood of the northern races, who now dominate the world. While we make no pretenses—and it is a pity that we do not even stand up to the few

we do make—we have here a religion whose essence is mercy. We have had an experience in free government, government based on the will of the governed—for government by majority is government with the consent of the governed—and we have been taught by that government what so few people of this world have learned, both the firmness to rule and the power of obedience to that rule. We are a Christian people, and our missionaries, or those imbued with the missionary spirit, clamor for the annexation of these islands for the purpose of shedding over them the light of the gospel. We are asked to do as Mahomet did with his creed—carry the Christian religion to these people upon the point of a bayonet, as he spread Islamism over Western Asia and Eastern Europe and Northern Africa on his scimiter.

There are two forces struggling for mastery here, and the better instincts of every Senator within the hearing of my voice lead him to side with me in the proposition that we do not want to shoot people into a civilized condition if we know how to get around it. The two forces to which I have referred as struggling for mastery are liberty, light, and morality—in a word, Christianity—contending against ignorance, greed, and tyranny, against the empires of Mammon and Belial. In the summer seas of the Tropics in both hemispheres two flags are afloat to-day upon two ancient cities. They both bear the emblem of this great Republic, the Stars and Stripes. One goes there and is floating in the free air as a harbinger of peace, order, prosperity, happiness, liberty. The other floats in Manila as an emblem of power, cold-blooded, determined to do what? To subjugate those people at whatever cost and force on them such a government as we think is best for them, and then, according to

the language of the resolution, determine afterwards as it may be to "our" advantage whether we will sell them or whether we will rule them in our "own" way, without regard to their rights.

Why not tell these people now before further blood is shed? We do not intend to do with you differently from what we do with the Cubans. We went into the war for the purposes of freeing a nation oppressed beyond all historical precedent almost. By accident or without premeditation you have fallen in our grasp. We bought you from Spain and have title. We only want enough of your territory to give us a harbor of refuge, a naval station, the right to protect you from outside interlopers, and to get such commercial advantages as you of right ought to give us. Pass a resolution of that kind, and then if those people will not listen to reason and continue to fire on the flag, I for one will say the blood will be on their own heads. Let slip the dogs of war and teach them to respect the Stars and Stripes. But we are there now upon a false pretense. We are there wrongfully. We are there without any justification to ourselves or to the civilized world.

I yield to no man in loyalty to the sentiments, my country, may it ever be right, but right or wrong, my country. But, oh, my God, when I think how dishonorable the prosecution of the war promises to be to us as a people, how little justification for it we have, even to ourselves, I would that you, my fellows on this floor, would pass a resolution which could bring about immediately a cessation of hostilities and a condition which might give the Philippine people the same right to bless us as Cuba will possess, and which command for us the admiration and respect of the civilized and pagan world.

CHAPTER XVIII.

ANNEXATION FROM A LEGAL POINT OF VIEW.

BY GEORGE G. VEST,

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MISSOURI.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That under the Constitution of the United States no power is given to the Federal Government to acquire territory to be held and governed permanently as colonies.

The colonial system of European nations can not be established under our present Constitution, but all territory acquired by the Government, except such small amount as may be necessary for coaling stations, correction of boundaries, and similar governmental purposes, must be acquired and governed with the purpose of ultimately organizing such territory into States suitable for admission into the Union.

I do not propose in my brief discussion of this resolution to say anything which will necessitate an executive session. It is not my purpose to discuss any treaty now pending or which may be hereafter submitted to the Senate.

It seems to me peculiarly appropriate at this time to examine what are the powers of Congress in regard to the acquisition and government of new territory. When the Attorney-General, the great law officer of the Government, declares publicly and deliberately that the Constitution made for thirteen half-rescued colonies, glad to be permitted to live at all, has grown too small for the greatest nation upon the face of the earth, it appears to me time to inquire what is that Constitution and the powers conferred upon Congress.

Every school-boy knows, or ought to know, that the Revolutionary war, which gave us existence as a people, was fought for four years exclusively against

the colonial system of Europe. Our fathers did not in the commencement of that struggle contemplate independence from the mother country. When the people of Rhode Island burned the British war sloop *Gaspee* in Narragansett Bay, and the people of Massachusetts threw overboard the cargo of tea in Boston Harbor, they acted as British subjects, proclaiming their loyalty to the Crown of England. When Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and Light-Horse Harry Lee met at the old Raleigh tavern in Williamsburg, Va., and indorsed the action of Rhode Island and Massachusetts, they proclaimed themselves English subjects, loyal to the King, and only demanded the rights that were given to them as Englishmen by *Magna Charta* and the *Bill of Rights*.

What is the colonial system against which our fathers protested? It is based upon the fundamental idea that the people of immense areas of territory can be held as subjects, never to become citizens; that they must pay taxes and be impoverished by governmental exaction without having anything to do with the legislation under which they live.

Against taxation without representation our fathers fought for the first four years of the Revolution, struggling against the system which England then attempted to impose upon them, and which was graphically described by Thomas Jefferson as the belief that nine-tenths of mankind were born bridled and saddled and the other tenth booted and spurred to ride them.

When war became flagrant and battles had been fought and blood had been shed, the patriots of the Revolution came to the conclusion that there must be final separation from the British throne. Thomas Jefferson then penned the immortal Declaration upon the basic idea that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

It is incredible that the men who fought for seven long years without money, without men almost, and without arms, against the proudest and strongest nation in the world, resisting the doctrine upon which the colonial system of Europe is based, should, after being rescued by Providence from its thralldom, deliberately put this doctrine in the written Constitution framed to govern them and their children. How can it be true that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed when millions of human beings are held without their consent as mere chattels, to be disposed of as the sovereign power of the mother country may choose?

But, passing from this historic argument, which seems to me unanswerable, the highest tribunal in the United States, the Supreme Court, has settled this question by a unanimous opinion, when the ablest lawyers in the country were upon the bench. I am now about to refer to a decision which I know will revive bitter memories unless those memories be happily eliminated by recent events. In the case of *Dred Scott against Sandford*, Chief Justice Taney, delivering the opinion of the court, which constituted the opinion of seven of the justices out of nine, effectually disposed of the question as to whether the United States could hold colonies without the intention or prospect of forming them into States and admitting them into the Union.

I am perfectly willing to eliminate that portion of this opinion which referred to the introduction of slavery into the Territories, notwithstanding an act of Congress that prohibited it, and also declaring that the Missouri compromise of 1820 was unconstitutional. These questions were settled by shot and shell and saber stroke for all time to come. But the portion of the opinion that I shall now ask the Secretary to

read was acquiesced in by the nine justices upon that court, including Justices McLean and Curtis, who disagreed with the majority in regard to the slavery question, but acquiesced in the opinion that this Government had no right to adopt the colonial system of Europe. I read this extract from the court's opinion.

[Supreme Court. Opinions of the court. *Dred Scott vs. Sandford.*]

There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish or maintain colonies bordering on the United States or at a distance, to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure, nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way except by the admission of new States. That power is plainly given; and if a new State is admitted it needs no further legislation by Congress, because the Constitution itself defines the relative rights and powers and duties of the State and the citizens of the State and the Federal Government. But no power is given to acquire a territory to be held and governed permanently in that character.

And, indeed, the power exercised by Congress to acquire territory and establish a government there, according to its own unlimited discretion, was viewed with great jealousy by the leading statesmen of the day. And in the *Federalist* (No. 33), written by Mr. Madison, he speaks of the acquisition of the Northwestern Territory by the Confederate States, by the cession from Virginia, and the establishment of a government there, as an exercise of power not warranted by the Articles of Confederation, and dangerous to the liberties of the people. And he urges the adoption of the Constitution as a security and safeguard against such an exercise of power.

We do not mean, however, to question the power of Congress in this respect. The power to expand the territory of the United States by the admission of new States is plainly given; and in the construction of this power by all the departments of the Government it has been held to authorize the acquisition of territory not fit for admission at the time but to be admitted as soon as its population and situation would entitle it to admission. It is acquired to become a State and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority; and as the propriety of admitting a new State is committed to the sound discretion of Congress the power to acquire territory for that purpose to be held by the United States until it is in a suitable condition to become a State upon an equal footing with the other States, must rest upon the same discretion.

I have stated that the nine justices of the Supreme Court acquiesced in that portion of the *Dred Scott* opinion, and I assert now, and challenge contradiction, that not one tribunal, Federal nor State, and not one public man of eminence in this country, has ever contradicted that portion of the *Dred Scott* decision until within the last six months, when the craze of expansion seems to have taken possession of a large portion of the American people.

Justice McLean, whose opinion was held, together with that of Justice Curtis, to have represented the opinion of the Northern people in regard to the power of a slaveholder to carry his slaves into a Territory, not only acquiesced in that portion of the Dred Scott decision which has been read, but proceeded to emphasize it in the elaborate and exhaustive opinion which he filed. I will now read extracts from the opinions of those two eminent lawyers.

In organizing the government of a Territory Congress is limited to means appropriate to the attainment of the constitutional object. No powers can be exercised which are prohibited by the Constitution or which are contrary to its spirit; so that, whether the object may be the protection of the persons and property of purchasers of the public lands or of communities who have been annexed to the Union by conquest or purchase, they are initiatory to the establishment of State governments, and no more power can be claimed or exercised than is necessary to the attainment of the end. This is the limitation of all the Federal powers.—Mr. Justice McLean.

Since, then, this power was manifestly conferred to enable the United States to dispose of its public lands to settlers and to admit them into the Union as States, when, in the judgment of Congress, they should be fitted therefor, since these were the needs provided for, since it is confessed that government is indispensable to provide for those needs, and the power is to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory, I can not doubt that this is a power to govern the inhabitants of the territory, by such laws as Congress deems needful, until they obtain admission as States.—Mr. Justice Curtis.

I call attention to the fact that in these two dissenting opinions as to the introduction of slavery into the Territories, but concurring opinions as to the want of power in this Government to hold colonies as colonies not to be admitted as States and with no prospect of becoming States, the fundamental idea is conveyed that all the power of Congress in regard to the Territories is to be exercised as an initiatory process to their becoming States of the American Union.

The Articles of Confederation—to show how sensitive were our fathers in regard to new territory to be added to this country—made no provision at all for the acquisition of new territory. As Chief Justice Taney said in delivering the opinion in the Dred Scott


case, Mr. Madison in the thirty-eighth paper of the *Federalist*, over the signature of Publius, criticised the action of the Congress under the Articles of Confederation in admitting the Northwestern Territory when donated to the United States by Virginia, and in dividing that Territory into States, first forming Territorial governments; and he used the unconstitutional action, the unauthorized action of the Congress of the Confederation as an argument why a remedy should be applied in the provisions of the new Constitution of 1789 then pending, and for the adoption of which he was contending.

What are the provisions of this Constitution of 1789, for the first time alluding to the acquisition and government of new territory? There are but two provisions in that Constitution pertinent to the present discussion—first, "That Congress shall have power to dispose of and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property of the United States." That is the first provision. Then follows, as a conclusion, that "new States may be admitted by Congress into the Union." What lawyer, what intelligent layman, will not admit that these two provisions are to be taken and construed together?

The Supreme Court of the United States has again and again decided, as Justice McLean and Justice Curtis said in their opinion in the *Dred Scott* case, that "needful rules and regulations" means that Congress shall prepare the Territory for admission into the Union as a State. I repeat, who can believe that there could be any other meaning, taking the history of the Revolution, the arguments of Mr. Madison, and the sensitiveness of the American people at that time to the addition of territory under any circumstances to the Union as it then existed?



Stephen M White



H. D. Mowsey.

The colonial system of Europe had not then assumed the vast proportions it has to-day. I have before me a paper taken from the consular reports for July last, which may prove of some interest in the present contingency. Great Britain expresses approbation of the new doctrine now proposed in the United States, which holds that we can enter upon the colonial system of Europe and hold colonies without any prospect or hope of their ever becoming members of our Union. It is not to be wondered at that the great apostle of the colonial system in Europe should now welcome with open arms the Republic they attempted to destroy, when it comes as a new recruit to the system which we fought for seven years, tracking the snow at Valley Forge with bloody feet in order to successfully resist it.

From this paper which I hold in my hand, and which I will ask to be inserted in my remarks for general information, it appears that Great Britain has in the mother country 120,979 square miles, and in her colonies 16,662,073 square miles. Great Britain has in the mother land 39,825,000 inhabitants, and in her colonies 322,000,000 subjects absolutely of the Empire, excepting Canada and Australia, where there is limited self-government, the remainder being Crown colonies, without the right even to govern themselves locally, and certainly without any right to participate in the action of Parliament.

France, also a republic nominally, comes next in this vast system. It must be said in justice to the Republic of France that much the largest portion, if not all, of its colonial possessions, were acquired under the Empire and the old Bourbon monarchy. Germany comes third, and so on through the list of European kingdoms and empires, with millions upon mil-

lions of human beings, hewers of wood and drawers of water, in utter defiance of human rights.

COLONIAL POSSESSIONS OF EUROPEAN STATES.

The extent of the German colonial possessions and protectorates, including the recently leased territory in Kyaochau Bay, is 2,600,000 square kilometers (1,615,577 square miles). The German Empire proper contains only 540,657 square kilometers (335,931 square miles), which is not much more than one-fifth of its colonial possessions. Togo, Kameruns, and German Southwest Africa contain together 874,189 square miles. German East Africa is nearly two-thirds as large as the last named, having 534,777 square miles.

England's colonies and possessions embrace no less than 16,662,073 square miles, or more than eighty-five times as much as the motherland.

A comparative table of the extent and number of inhabitants of the European colonial possessions shows:

Country.	Extent.		Population.	
	Motherland. Sq. Miles.	Colonies. Sq. Miles.	Motherland.	Colonies.
Great Britain.....	120,979	16,662,073	39,825,000	322,000,000
France	204,092	2,505,000	38,520,000	44,290,000
German Empire....	208,830	1,615,577	53,325,000	7,450,000
Portugal	36,038	809,914	5,050,000	10,215,000
Holland	12,648	783,000	4,930,000	34,210,000
Spain	197,670	405,458	17,300,000	9,800,000
Italy	110,646	242,420	31,290,000	195,000
Denmark (Faroe Islands, Iceland, and Greenland)	15,289	86,614	2,175,000	130,000

Germany takes third place as regards extent of colonial territory, but only sixth in point of population of her possessions. Only Great Britain, France, Holland, and Portugal have more inhabitants in their colonial possessions and protectorates than there are at home.

I assert that the fundamental idea of our American institutions is citizenship to all within the jurisdiction of the Government, except to the Indian tribes. The Constitution makes an exception as to the Indians because their position was *sui generis* and entirely anomalous. As the Supreme Court said in the Cherokee-Georgia case, the Indian tribes are independent dependencies. We have recognized their right to their own tribal customs and institutions, and at the same time put upon them nonintercourse laws, and exercised by legislation the power of control.

With that single exception all the people of the United States within its jurisdiction are to be citizens, and whatever may be said in regard to the older in-

habitants of new territory that may be acquired by this country, it is beyond any question, under the terms of the fourteenth amendment, that all children born within our jurisdiction, no matter what the condition of the parent is as to citizenship, are made citizens of the United States and of the State in which they reside.

The Supreme Court has decided that the child of Chinese parents born in this country becomes a citizen, but that Congress can not take away the right of citizenship conferred by the Constitution on account of birth. If this is not settled by adjudication, nothing can be settled by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The fourteenth amendment provides that all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to its jurisdiction are citizens of the United States and of the State in which they reside.

When, then, we take jurisdiction over millions of acres of what is now foreign soil and bring under our jurisdiction millions of human beings, whatever may be the case as to the citizenship of the older inhabitants of those areas, their children born under the jurisdiction of the United States become citizens, entitled to all the immunities and privileges of citizenship. If this amendment does not provide this, it is absolutely nugatory and void. If that is not one result of the war crystallized in the Constitution for all time and beyond question, then the results of that struggle are entirely misunderstood by the people of the United States and the world.

The fifteenth amendment provides that all citizens shall be entitled to the right of suffrage, being supplementary to the fourteenth amendment, which provides that all persons born and naturalized in this country, and subject to its jurisdiction, shall be citizens, obvi-

ously intending to exclude the children of ambassadors and of persons in transit through the country, as, for instance, in going from Mexico to Canada, when children are born en route. The words "and subject to its jurisdiction" apply to that class of persons, but except such children and the Indians. It was unquestionably the intention of the framers of this amendment and of the States which adopted it that American citizenship should apply to all the inhabitants of our common country.

But it is said that we have abandoned by precedent the application of the doctrine announced in this resolution, and that we have by legislative action admitted the right of the United States to acquire by purchase large tracts of territory to be held as colonies. I emphatically, distinctly, and without qualification deny that assertion. It is the resort of desperate disputants and anonymous patriots, who appear from day to day in the public press, and attack public men as Bourbons and decrepit statesmen because we choose to adhere to the principles of the Constitution and the traditions of our fathers, and to resist this new evangel, which threatens to sweep away all conservatism from the land.

When did we admit territory to be held as colonies? Was the Northwestern Territory brought under the jurisdiction of the United States in order to be held as a colony? The author of the Declaration of Independence was the author of the ordinance of 1784, called the ordinance of 1787, and in it provision was made for a Territorial governor, a Territorial judge, a Territorial marshal, and that as soon as 5,000 white male inhabitants should be found in that Territory, they should have the right to elect a Territorial legislature and pass laws for their own government.

Who will be reckless enough to say that Thomas

Jefferson, who penned the words "All governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," would have degraded and branded with infamy that princely gift of Virginia to the country by inserting in it the hateful principle of the colonial system of Europe? Did we depart from the doctrine I am here to-day advocating with all my strength when we admitted Louisiana, during the Presidency of Jefferson, to the jurisdiction of the United States?

In the act of cession from France is found a provision that as soon as possible the inhabitants of that Territory shall be made citizens of the United States and the Territory itself admitted as a State of the Union. Did we give up the doctrine which I am here to-day advocating when Florida was purchased from Spain and brought within the jurisdiction of the United States? In the act of cession from Spain is contained the same provision as is found in the Louisiana purchase, that the inhabitants as soon as possible shall be made citizens and Florida admitted as a State of the Union.

But we are told by eminent statesmen that when Alaska came into the Union we surrendered this whole question. When Russia ceded Alaska to the United States the same provision was put in the act of cession, that the inhabitants of Alaska as soon as possible should become citizens and Alaska be admitted as a State of the Union.

When, where, how have we ever surrendered the great doctrine that this is a confederation of sovereign States and that there are known to the Constitution but four forms of government—first, the National government, then the State government, then the Territorial government, and then the District of Columbia? It is not possible to point out any other form of government under the Constitution.

It is said by the expansionists that Alaska was called, in the act to furnish a government for it, the district of Alaska. That is true. That act was drawn by ex-President Harrison, then a member of the Senate and chairman of the Committee on Territories, of which I was a member, and I called the attention of the committee at the time to the argument substantially I now make, that there was but one district possible under the Constitution, and that was the district of ten miles square, to be freed from political excitement, and to be used as the seat of government for the whole United States.

I was answered by the chairman of the committee that the word "district" made no difference; that the act itself provided for a territorial governor, a territorial judge, a territorial marshal, and four commissioners with the jurisdiction of justices of the peace in the State of Oregon. But the Supreme Court of the United States has settled this question. Mr. Justice Harlan, delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court in what is known as the Alaska case, declared that Alaska was a Territory of the United States, and that the supreme court of Alaska was properly added to the Ninth judicial circuit under the general law, which provides that from the supreme court of the Territory there shall be the right of appeal to the appellate courts in their respective circuits, and I read that decision:

In 163 U. S., steamer *Coquitlam vs. United States*, Justice Harlan, delivering the opinion of the Court, says:

"Alaska is one of the Territories of the United States. It was so designated in that order and has always been so regarded. And the court established by the act of 1884 is the court of last resort within the limits of that Territory. It is, therefore, in every substantial sense the supreme court of that Territory.

"No reason can be suggested why a Territory of the United States in which the court of last resort is called a supreme court, should be assigned to some circuit established by Congress that does not apply with full force to the Territory of Alaska, in which the court of last resort is designated as the district court of Alaska. The title of the Territorial court is not so material as its character. Looking at the whole scope of the act of 1891, we do not doubt that Con-

gress contemplated that the final orders and decrees of the courts of last resort in the organized Territories of the United States—by whatever name those courts were designated in legislative enactments—should be reviewed by the proper circuit court of appeals, leaving to this court the assignment of the respective Territories among the existing circuits."

The act providing a government for Alaska was drafted in accordance with the ordinance of 1784, called the ordinance of 1787, which provided for the government of the Northwestern Territory. The only difference between the two acts is that no provision is made in the Alaska statute for the subsequent creation of a Territorial legislature, prescribing the qualifications of electors of the members of that Territorial legislature when elected. It was never pretended that Alaska was anything but a Territory of the United States until within the last six months, when the new apostles of a new system have undertaken to teach the American people that the fathers were mistaken in our form of government.

But, I come now to the great, overwhelming, and crucial argument made by the expansionists in favor of this new system. Driven in desperation by the earlier history of our country and by the decisions of the Supreme Court to their last alternative, they claim that the Territories, whether organized or unorganized—and newly acquired—are not subject to the Constitution of the United States and that the Constitution applies alone to the States of the Union. They quote in support of this monstrous proposition—for I can denominate it nothing else—the great name and authority of Daniel Webster. I am sorry to say that Mr. Webster, for whose learning and ability I have the highest respect, permitted himself, in an acrimonious debate with John C. Calhoun on the government of the territory acquired from Mexico in 1848, to say that the Constitution did not apply to the Territories.

Unfortunately at that period the slavery question

overshadowed everything else, and when new territory came into the Union the question was only, "Is it free or slave?" Calhoun contended that the Constitution of the United States recognized slavery, and that ipso facto it was extended over the newly acquired territory, and consequently carried the institution of slavery into it. Mr. Webster combated this position, and in doing so permitted himself to say that the Constitution did not apply to the Territories, but only to the States. He went further and asserted that under the Constitution the Federal Government had no right to acquire territory by purchase or conquest for any purpose whatever, ignoring the treaty-making power and the war-making power, which the Supreme Court and every respectable lawyer now admit gives to us the right to acquire territory by conquest or by purchase.

I repeat, that I have the highest respect for Mr. Webster as a lawyer and statesman, but the proposition he advanced is so monstrous as not to permit discussion. To say that the citizens of a Territory under the jurisdiction of the United States are excluded from the provisions of the Bill of Rights is to say that they are at the mercy of Congress without limitation; that Congress can prohibit the free exercise of religion; take away the right of trial by jury; take away immunity from unreasonable search and seizure, and destroy all the great rights guaranteed by the Bill of Rights to all the people of the United States. For what did our fathers struggle?

For what did their descendants labor and toil if this monstrous proposition be now true? Fortunately for the country, and for human rights and constitutional liberty, the Supreme Court of the United States has, in repeated adjudications, settled this question, finally and forever against Mr. Webster's position.

As early as January, 1820, Chief Justice Marshall, in delivering the unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court, in the case of *Loughborough*, decided emphatically that the term "United States" in the Constitution meant the States and the Territories and every foot of the soil over which the flag of our country floats.

John Marshall wrote no nebulous opinion. His knowledge of the Constitution was only equaled by his command of the English language. I say now, although I differ with him in many respects politically, that until this country cease to exist and the English language cease to be spoken, John Marshall, of Virginia, will stand without a peer in the judicial annals of this or any other country. What said Chief Justice Marshall in 4 *Wheaton*, in the case of *Loughborough vs. Blake*?

In 4 *Wheaton*, "*Loughborough vs. Blake*," Chief Justice Marshall, delivering the opinion of the court, said:

"The eighth section of the first article gives to Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises for the purposes thereafter mentioned. This grant is general, without limitation as to place. It consequently extends to all places over which the Government extends. If this could be doubted, the doubt is removed by the subsequent words, which modify the grant. These words are: 'but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.' It will not be contended that the modification of the power extends to places to which the power itself does not extend.

The power, then, to lay and collect duties, imposts and excises may be exercised, and must be exercised, throughout the United States. Does this term designate the whole or any particular portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania; and it is not less necessary, on the principles of our Constitution, that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises should be observed in the one than the other. Since, then, the power to lay and collect taxes, which includes direct taxes, is obviously coextensive with the power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises, and since the latter extends throughout the United States, it follows that the power to impose direct taxes also extends throughout the United States."

It seems to me that this decision is a finality in regard to this new and astounding claim that the Territories of the United States are not embraced within the term "United States," and that the limitations of the Constitution do not apply to them.

We are told now under this astounding announcement that one rate of taxation can prevail in the Territories and another in the States, notwithstanding the provision of the Constitution that all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the whole United States.

If this doctrine as now announced be true, not one of the limitations, not one of the grants, not one of the immunities provided for by the Constitution applies to the Territories of the United States, but only to organized States. I might submit this question with the opinion of Chief Justice Marshall, believing that the American people are not so besotted with the glare of military glory or the glitter of commercial advantage as to forget the great jurist who did so much to expound the Constitution of our country; but I will go further. In 101 United States, in the case of *National Bank vs. The County of Yankton*, Chief Justice Waite, in delivering the unanimous opinion of the court, said:

All territory within the jurisdiction of the United States not included in any State must necessarily be governed by or under the authority of Congress. The Territories are but political subdivisions of the outlying dominion of the United States. Their relation to the General Government is much the same as that which counties bear to the respective States, and Congress may legislate for them as a State does for its municipal organizations. The organic law of a Territory takes the place of a constitution as the fundamental law of the local government. It is obligatory on and binds the Territorial authorities; but Congress is supreme, and for the purposes of this department of its governmental authority has all the powers of the people of the United States, except such as have been expressly or by implication reserved in the prohibitions of the Constitution.

In the organic act of Dakota there was not an express reservation of power in Congress to amend the acts of the Territorial legislature, nor was it necessary. Such a power is an incident of sovereignty and continues until granted away. Congress may not only abrogate laws of the Territorial legislatures, but it may itself legislate directly for the local government. It may make a void act of the Territorial legislature valid, and a valid act void. In other words, it has full and complete legislative authority over the people of the Territories and all the departments of the Territorial governments. It may do for the Territories what the people, under the Constitution of the United States, may do for the States.

Now what can the people of the United States do for a State? Can they take away from the people of a

State the right of trial by jury, or of habeas corpus, or immunity from illegal arrest and search and seizure, or take away from them the right of religious opinion? If a Territory occupy the relation to the Federal Government that a county does to a State, what can the State authorities do as to a county? Can they govern it without reference to the State constitution; and could the Congress of the United States, under the decision of Chief Justice Waite, concurred in by all the judges, govern the Territories at their own will without regard to the limitations and prohibitions of the Federal Constitution?

I shall not weary the Senate by reading other opinions, but I will refer to them, and Senators can satisfy themselves. In the case of *Thompson vs. Utah*, decided in 170 U. S., the Supreme Court unanimously declared that the right of trial by jury in criminal cases to the people of a Territory could not be taken away by Congress and that the powers of Congress as to Territories were limited and defined by the Constitution of the United States and not unrestricted. They made the same decision in two other cases, the *American Publishing Society vs. Fisher*, 166 U. S., 464, and *Crandall vs. Nevada*, 6 Wallace, 35. There can no longer be a question, nor the shadow of a question, that the Congress of the United States is as to the Territories limited in its action by the Federal Constitution.

I have not controverted, and do not propose to controvert, the power of the Federal Government to acquire and govern territory, but I do deny that territory can be acquired to be held as colonies, peopled by millions of subjects not citizens, with no hope or prospect of its ever becoming a State of the Union. I may be answered by the statement that this is not a practical question, because Congress has exclusive jurisdic-

tion as to the admission of States, and it may hold this territory indefinitely without any idea of its ever coming into the Union; in other words, establish under cover and by a fraud upon the Constitution the colonial system which the Constitution never contemplated.

I will not insult my brother Senators by supposing that they would thus evade the spirit and letter of the Constitution, and when believing that the colonial system is not possible in this country, would vote to take in vast tracts of land inhabited by barbarians, intending never to allow this territory to come in as a State, but to hold it for commercial advantages alone, in violation of the fundamental law of the land. Whenever the Congress of the United States becomes so degraded as to do this, it matters little what occurs in the future. It is simply a question of time when the disastrous end will come.

We are told that this country can do anything, Constitution or no Constitution. We are a great people—great in war, great in peace—but we are not greater than the people who once conquered the world, not with long-range guns and steel-clad ships, but with the short sword of the Roman legion and the wooden galleys that sailed across the Adriatic. The colonial system destroyed all hope of republicanism in the olden time. It is an appanage of monarchy. It can exist in no free country, because it uproots and eliminates the basis of all republican institutions, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

I know not what may be done with the glamor of foreign conquest and the greed of the commercial and money-making classes in this country. For myself, I would rather quit public life and would be willing to risk life itself rather than give my consent to this

fantastic and wicked attempt to revolutionize our Government and substitute the principles of our hereditary enemies for the teachings of Washington and his associates.

[Extract of speech delivered December 12, 1898.]

CHAPTER XIX.

THE PASSING OF CONSTITUTIONAL RESTRAINTS.

BY HON. STEPHEN M. WHITE,

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM CALIFORNIA.

The extracts which I present are announcements of the Supreme Court of the United States and include declarations from the President of the United States and from the distinguished naval commander whose victory at Manila has made him an historical character.

This grant (the power to lay and collect taxes, etc.) is general without limitation as to place. It consequently extends to all places over which the Government extends.—(Loughborough vs. Blake, per Marshall, C. J., 5 Wheat., 323.)

There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish or maintain colonies bordering on the United States or at a distance, to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure. * * * It (the new acquisition) is required to become a State and not to be held as a colony by Congress with absolute authority.—(Dred Scott vs. Sandford, per Taney, C. J., 19 How., 393.)

This decision has never been reconsidered in the Supreme Court of the United States.—(Justice Miller's Lectures, page 406.)

Manifestly the nationality of the inhabitants of territory acquired by conquest or cession becomes that of the government under whose dominion they passed, subject to the right of election on their part to retain their former nationality by removal or otherwise as may be provided.—(Boyd vs. Nebraska, per Fuller, C. J., 143 U. S., 186.)

That the provisions of the Constitution of the United States relating to the right of trial by jury in suits at common law apply to the Territories of the United States is no longer an open question.—(Thompson vs. Utah, per Harlan, J., 170 U. S., 346; Callan vs. Wilson, 127 U. S., 551.)

I speak not of forcible annexation, for that can not be thought of. That, by our code of morality, would be criminal aggression.—(President McKinley, messages, December, 1897, and April 11, 1898.)

The United States disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island (Cuba) except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.—(Joint resolution, Congressional Record, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, volume 31, part 4, page 3393.)

In a telegram sent to the Department on June 23, I expressed the opinion that "these people (the Filipinos) are far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba, and I am familiar with both races." Further intercourse with them has confirmed me in this opinion.—(Admiral Dewey to Secretary of Navy, August 29, 1898; Senate Document No. 62, part 1, Fifty-fifth Congress, third session.)

That flag has been planted in two hemispheres, and there it remains, the symbol of liberty and law, of peace and progress. Who will withdraw from the people over whom it floats its protecting folds? Will the people of the South help to haul it down?—(President McKinley, address at Atlanta, Ga., December 16, 1898.)

The mission of the United States (to the Philippine Islands) is one of benevolent assimilation, substituting the mild sway of justice and right for arbitrary rule.—(President McKinley to the Secretary of War, December 21, 1898.)

I do not intend to elaborately discuss the question of law heretofore debated. I do not believe that it will serve any useful purpose to enter into an attempted differentiation between the authority of the United States in its relation to foreign powers and its authority as regards domestic affairs. I dispute the contention which seeks to give jurisdiction in the one case and to deny it in the other, and which limits the operation of the Constitution as to the rights of Territories and new acquisitions to Congressional discretion, denying to those within such area "the equal protection" of our laws and reducing their constitutional rights to the insignificant and problematical protection of colonial dependencies.

It appears to me that when our Constitution was made it was supposed that the United States would never extend its domain save over those who were not only within the equal protection of its laws, but who were competent to participate in the efforts of an aspiring people to conserve for themselves and humanity the benefits of representative civilization. Whatever may be the truth as to the issue of power, I design to discuss this subject more largely from the standpoint of policy.

It is conceded by all that the latter proposition is open for debate. Those who are regardless of organic restraints so admit. I do not desire to detain the Senate with any elaboration regarding the opinions of our courts or the views of eminent lawyers with reference to the subject of the construction of the Constitution

on expansion problems. It is certain that we can never agree as to that proposition. The sentiments of Senators of uncommon ability, the carefully expressed ideas of men of profound learning in this country and elsewhere, as expressed in the public prints, demonstrate the futility of any endeavor to procure accord upon this topic.

We are to-day confronted by a situation which all must admit does not agree in all respects, if it does not differ in principle with that which has heretofore been presented.

It will be conceded, I take it, that while we may have the authority to annex territory, as contended by the most advanced advocates of annexation, and to the ultimate extent for which they plead. Notwithstanding all this, the propriety of the exercise of such power must depend upon circumstances; and the fact of the possession of the authority furnishes no reason for any assertion not warranted by right.

Hence, finally, speaking from the standpoint of policy, we must ask ourselves this question: Shall we bring the Philippine Islands within our confines? Shall we introduce them to this home of intelligence and manly effort? Shall we acquire these islands under the conditions now confronting us? Is it better for us that we should do so? This is the issue. I shall endeavor to impress upon the Senate the fact that "charity begins at home," that while we may owe much without, there never has been a time when the mission of this Republic based upon solid principles, involved the necessity of embarking in the instantaneous civilization of foreign peoples or in converting into its own confines the seeds of dissolution. If we or the Filipinos must suffer I vote for our own benefit.

We know but little of the true inwardness of the Philippine Islands. No one seems to be thoroughly advised as to the exact character of all of the inhabitants of that territory. We are unable even to say how many islands there are which come within this attempted cession. We can not define the area so far as it is fit for cultivation, civilization, or for any other legitimate end. But in the midst of this ambiguity we at least know that the Philippines are tenanted by a very peculiar mass, a heterogeneous compound of inefficient oriental humanity. I care not, for the purposes of my argument, whether these islanders are fit for free government as you and as I understand it. If they are so fitted, they should be permitted to establish a free government; if they are not so fitted, they should not be brought into an alliance with us; we do not in that event want them. Those who are incompetent to control themselves should not be of us. We do not seek the irresponsible.

I have examined with some care the record which was made before the Peace Commission of which you were an honored and efficient member, and I fail there to find anything altering or affecting my view as regards the treaty.

In the first place, it is evident that the Philippine people suffered under the dominion of the parent country. I do not doubt that. It is clear that gross exactions in the way of taxation and illegitimate imposts were levied upon them; that personal indignities and cruelties were inflicted. I am ready to concede that the same record contains recitations of some abominable transactions on the part of the insurgents. I might refer to the statement of a witness before the Paris arbitration tribunal, who deposed as follows:

This witness said that a certain priest of bad char-

acter was sent to the province of Cavite. He described his treatment thus:

And there the rebels caught him in this last rebellion, and more to ridicule him than anything else, I think, they made him their bishop. They said, "Mind what you do. You can be our bishop and take charge of our clergy, but don't you attempt anything behind our backs." He thought he was quite safe, and he was found taking sketches and notes of their strongholds. He had already made arrangements with the monks for their delivery. They caught him and they said it was treachery—he had made negotiations with the Augustine monks in Manila—and after proper trial he was condemned to death. He was tied to a post, without a hat and without water, and died of sunstroke fever, and hunger, and that was his end.

The character of the Filipino is in controversy. As I have said, my argument does not depend upon an accurate exhibition of his real traits. The reason already given in this regard is sufficient. If he knows enough to govern himself, we should let him alone. If he does not know enough, we do not desire to associate with him.

We have in this record the testimony of Consul Wildman as to the character of Aguinaldo. In a letter, from which I will in a moment quote, he extols that chieftain. Later on, in Senate Document No. 62, part 1, present session, we find that he questions the sincerity of Aguinaldo and intimates most strongly that he has outgrown his usefulness. I quote from page 336 of the above cited document:

I have lived among the Malays of the Straits Settlements and have been an honored guest of the different sultanates. I have watched their system of government and have admired their intelligence, and I rank them high among the semi-civilized nations of the earth. The natives of the Philippine Islands belong to the Malay race; and while there are very few pure Malays among their leaders, I think their stock has rather been improved than debased by admixture. I consider the forty or fifty Philippine leaders with whose fortunes I have been very closely connected both the superiors of the Malays and the Cubans. Aguinaldo, Agoncilla and Sandico are all men who would all be leaders in their separate departments in any country, while among the wealthy Manila men who live in Hongkong and who are spending their money liberally for the overthrow of the Spaniards and the annexation to the United States men like the Cortes family and the Basa family would hold their own among bankers and lawyers anywhere.

Again he says:

There has been a systematic attempt to blacken the name of Aguinaldo and his cabinet on account of the questionable terms of

their surrender to Spanish forces a year ago this month. It has been said that they sold their country for gold; but this has been conclusively disproved, not only by their own statements but by the speech of the late Governor-General Rivera in the Spanish Senate June 11, 1898. He said that Aguinaldo undertook to submit if the Spanish Government would give a certain sum to the widows and orphans of the Insurgents. He then admits that only a tenth part of this sum was ever given to Aguinaldo and that the other promises made he did not find it expedient to keep.

Further on he remarks:

The Insurgents are fighting for freedom from the Spanish rule and rely upon the well-known sense of justice that controls all the actions of our Government as to their future. (Id., page 337.)

This consul, and also Mr. Williams, who afterwards incurred the displeasure of the State Department, and seemingly in response to criticisms made as to his conduct, questioned the attitude of Aguinaldo and his colleagues, appear to have been excessively anxious to retain their positions, and this may account for the want of lucidity in their correspondence, taken as a whole. Yet I must confess that I arise from a perusal of this record believing that there are a number of able men among the Filipinos, persons who are adequately educated to attend to the more complex affairs of life, but that the vast mass of the inhabitants are, and will for many years remain, in a condition far below that which every well-informed American believes to be essential to citizenship and even to presence within our borders. I do not mean by this that no local government can be established, but I do mean that no governmental institution on as high a plane as ours will be maintained for many years in that region.

But such government will never be an accomplished fact unless opportunity is given. Whatever may be asserted in enthusiastic moments, I do not hesitate to say that it is not the mission or place of the American people to assume responsibility for such a population or to educate, otherwise than by example, and certainly not under the influence of the sword, the pro-

testing occupants of tropical climes. I deny our duty to civilize such an aggregation. Clearly alien races who, as far as history has furnished evidence, have not been found fitted for the highest civilization, ought not to be introduced here, as they are not competent to participate intelligently and profitably in the affairs of this Government.

Upon another occasion I had an opportunity to examine, and I attempted to explain, why it was and is that a remote nation or people of habits varying from ours in almost every direction can not be a valuable acquisition, and can not constitute a desirable addition to the American Republic.

Assume that we import an alien and novel people numbering 10,000,000. Whether they are to be citizens or are not to be such—dropping that branch of the inquiry—they are at least brought within the United States. We are responsible for them to the world, and they are to some extent supposed to be responsible to us. What advantage can they be to this Republic? Can they furnish us anything that will tend to make us more stable, more civilized, more enlightened? Clearly not. Do we offer them a government of their choice? Do they petition us asking that we receive them? Do they seek for themselves and their posterity the benefits of our civilization? No; they repudiate our attempt to govern them; they demand that they shall be permitted to pursue their own way; they insist they should be allowed to solve domestic and governmental issues for themselves, and that they ought to be allowed to at least experiment as to whether they are or are not competent to sustain a government adapted to their wants. They even intimate that we are to join in international land grabbing, and that the Spanish war was for conquest—not for humanity's sake.

Ought we to allow the Filipino an opportunity? If we say that he is not fitted to govern himself, by what process of reasoning can we reach the conclusion that therefore, and on that account, we ought to absorb him, especially when we announce in advance that we are not acquiring possessions for the purpose of dominion or statehood?

It is clear to me that in the evolution of those affairs which surround this matter a clearly defined policy has eventuated looking to permanent retention and colonial government. It is the intention and the object and the aim of the present administration and those who are supporting this project to annex these islands for all time. Title is sought. The treaty speaks of relinquishment as to Cuba, but uses the word cession as regards the Philippines. Will Senators adopt the resolution offered by the Senator from Georgia? No. If there is no desire to lastingly hold this group, can there be any objection to the adoption of that resolution?

But what do we find outside of this? I have already referred to the remarks of the President of the United States delivered, not in his message only, for in his message he refers to forcible annexation as a crime and denounces it as an offense against public morality as defined by us, but on a public occasion he again referred to the Filipinos and spoke of the flag that had been planted in that hemisphere. He said:

There it remains the symbol of liberty and law, of peace and progress. Who will withdraw from the people over whom it floats its protecting folds? Will the people of the South elect to haul it down?

And in the letter to the Secretary of War, to which I have also adverted, the President declared that our policy toward those islands is that of "benevolent assimilation." What is meant by "benevolent assimila-

tion?" Who shall define that? The word "assimilation" implies absorption, taking in. True, the President guarantees us that he will not assimilate those people violently. There will no doubt be something of an anæsthetic character with reference to that assimilation.

For my own part, I am opposed to the entire design, but upon any theory whatever, upon any theory which anyone, outside of a very few Senators, is willing to father in this chamber, it follows that it is our duty, if we have the slightest regard for our position before the world, to indicate in advance what we intend to do.

Now, let me ask any Senator on the other side of the proposition whether at the time the Senator from Colorado offered an amendment to the Cuban resolutions, which has already been read, in which it was said by this body and by the Congress—

That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

—there was any admission that we were waging a war of conquest? No one had the boldness to make such a declaration.

For what purpose did the United States embark in the war? It is well known here that the many difficulties which we now meet were anticipated by some of us, but no one supposed that we would ever attempt to absorb islands on the Asiatic coast, and compel them into actual close communion with us permanently. Had an amendment to that resolution been offered providing that all possible acquisitions should be brought within its scope and its letter, there would have been no opposition.

Remembering that Admiral Dewey says, from per-

sonal contact with the Filipinos and the Cubans, that the former are better fitted for independent government than the latter, are we not honestly bound by the spirit of our declaration to give an independent government to not only the Cuban people, but likewise to the Filipinos, and we refuse to declare that the same rule which we applied to Cuba will be applied in the case under consideration.

While I repeat that I do not believe either or any of these races are really fitted for companionship with us, yet, under the peculiar circumstances of this situation, I am willing to apply to the Philippine Islands the same rule that we have already declared we design to enforce in Cuba. Whether we apply that rule or not depends upon our good faith, and it is to be presumed that we will be loyal to our pledges, although we know that we will have opposition of a mercenary character. There is no danger in such a course. The Filipinos solicit it; the world will be satisfied; all possible obligations will be fulfilled.

I affirm again that the policy can not be to treat the Philippine Islands as we treat Cuba, or else Senators would not object to voting for a resolution of that purport.

Is there anything so alluring in the Philippine Islands, even of a business character, that we should be willing to throw aside our traditions, to disregard the teachings of our consciences, and to set aside every declaration which statesmen of national repute have ever made? Is there anything, I repeat, alluring in a business way?

Permit me to say that I do not give undue weight to purely commercial considerations. When I believe that we can not morally or in accord with our duty incorporate the Philippines, the affair is at an end. But I appreciate that in some quarters a different con-

ception prevails. Boards of trade and chambers of commerce in various localities look forward to and with glowing words portray the riches which they seem to think will drop into our laps. Thus was the siren voice raised in the case of Hawaii, and yet it is demonstrable to-day, as some of us said it would be demonstrated, that the local sugar growers alone made fortunes from annexation. Then we were told that numerous laborers would go to Hawaii and find a long-sought opportunity for the development of their interests, and yet we have ascertained from experience that these anticipations were not realized and that there is no opening for such immigration.

That acquisition was only valuable to the few and only dangerous as I thought, in the way of a precedent. However this may be, that is history; and the only excuse for our action is that it was not of a character sufficiently important to make it vital. But here we travel thousands of miles farther, and instead of having 100,000 people to deal with, we have 8,000,000 or 10,000,000, more obviously incompetent and more difficult to control.

When you seek to acquire property, do you not look to the title and right of your grantor? Do you not ascertain what power he had, what jurisdiction he enjoyed, and what possession he enjoys? If he had nothing standing on the records, he must have had possession indicating his entry and justifying his pretensions. If we cause peace and order to prevail in the Philippines, it will be the result of conquest, not of Spain, but of those whom Spain never subdued.

There are half of these islands which have never been under the control of Spain. What must we do with them? If we ratify this treaty and pass laws under it, we have no alternative but to invade and by power subject them. We can not, as a great nation,

stand aside and permit unchallenged rebellion. If we ratify the treaty, we must show the nations of the world that we have not only the technical right, but also the physical strength, to enforce our mandates; and hence it follows irresistibly that we must send our arms abroad and bring the Mohammedans and others into subjection.

What kind of an enterprise is this to be? What will it cost, not in money, but in life? When we commenced the Spanish war, we did not, I am persuaded, anticipate such a possibility. There would have been more hesitation had we done so. Will we be able, we who live and constitute the "land of the free and home of the brave," to justify ourselves to ourselves if we assume the responsibility of a war in the Tropics in such a cause?

Is this new possession untenanted and barren? Are the islands uninhabited? On pages 404 and 405 of the document already named will be found a statement by General Greene, an officer who seemed to be very well advised. He informs us that, taking the islands of Luzon, Panay, Cebu, Leyte, Bohol, and Negros, the average population per square mile is 91; that of the island of Cebu is 210, and of the island of Luzon 79.

He remarks:

The density of population in these six islands is nearly 50 per cent greater than in Illinois and Indiana (census of 1890), greater than in Spain, about one-half as great as in France, and one-third as great as in Japan and China.

Then he gives the exact figures. He also furnishes information regarding Mindanao, Samar, Mindoro, Romblon, and Masbate, where he finds a population per square mile of 11. The leading islands of the group, those which are accessible, have a population greater per square mile than Spain itself, and a population greater per square mile than the great States of Illinois and Indiana.

What is to be gained by the contemplated policy? If mere trade is the object, there is no difficulty in providing for it with any government which may be established. But I fail to see from statistical examination anything to justify us in assuming that the profits attending annexation and depending upon it will nearly atone for the enormous expenditure and extravagant outlay which must prove essential. Furthermore, some years ago in the Congress of the United States there was a positive and aggressive agitation as to the Chinese question, arising from the protest of the people of our Pacific coast. They came before Congress and urged restrictive legislation, and that legislation was enacted, and we excluded Chinese laborers from our shores. We kept them out, although they sought to come in occasional shiploads only. Here it is proposed to bring in an entire population, possessing to a large degree the same competitive character, containing millions and millions of people—no one can give the precise number. It is well enough to pretend that constitutional guaranties may be disregarded and that our newly annexed friends may be limited to a certain part of the United States. God forbid that we shall ever have a nation so divided against itself that we will not permit those who reside in one part to visit elsewhere. No such attempted rule, I trust, will ever find its place, notwithstanding the agitations of any moment, upon the statute books of the American Republic.

Without entering into any extended discussion of the subject, I am very clear that every child born anywhere within the United States, whether you define it internationally or nationally or otherwise, is a citizen of the United States.

This must be true under the decision rendered by

the Supreme Court in *United States vs. Wong Kim Ark* (169 U. S., 649).

There it was decided that a child born in the United States of Chinese parents who, at the time of his birth, are subjects of the Emperor of China, but have a domicile in the United States and are not employed in any diplomatic or official capacity under the Emperor of China, becomes at the time of his birth a citizen of the United States by virtue of the first clause of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

It will be noted that the power granted to Congress by the Constitution is "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization." It is not easy to discover, even if we bring the Filipino within our fold, how we can have "a uniform rule of naturalization" without including the offspring of those who inhabit the islands from Mindanao to Luzon.

The Senator from Louisiana has contributed an able argument regarding the citizen status of the Filipinos in case of annexation.

As was well said by ex-Senator Edmunds:

A republic can have no subjects. Its people must be either citizens, slaves, or aliens.

True, we may prevent the inhabitants of the Philippines from voting for President or members of Congress and from otherwise availing themselves of some other benefits which they may theoretically enjoy by leaving the group in a Territorial condition. Nevertheless, this will not affect the rule announced by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Boyd vs. Nebraska*, already mentioned. It was there remarked:

Mr. Justice Story, in his *Commentaries on the Constitution*, says: "Every citizen of a State is ipso facto a citizen of the United States."

and this is the rule expressed by Mr. Rawle in his work on the Constitution. Mr. Justice Curtis, in *Dred Scott vs. Sandford*, 60 U. S., 19 How., 393, 576, expressed the opinion that under the Constitution of the United States "every free person born on the soil of a State, who is a citizen of that State by force of its constitution or laws, is also a citizen of the United States." And Mr. Justice Swayne, in *Slaughterhouse Cases*, 83 U. S., 16 Wall., 36, 126, declared that "a citizen of a State is ipso facto a citizen of the United States."

I do not believe that a man who is a citizen when in one part of the United States can be anything less, no matter where he goes.

As I understand it, it was the design and the intention of the framers of our organic law that the burdens resulting from revenue taxation, that the fiscal obligations which we must endure because of the necessity of maintaining the Government, must be distributed uniformly over the entire United States; and until there is a decision from a more authoritative tribunal than can be found in any convention or university, I must beg leave to stand to that view.

It is said that after all we owe an obligation of an ill-defined nature to somebody with reference to the Philippines which makes it necessary to absorb them. To whom do we owe such obligation? Do we owe it to the people there? If so, surely they have a right to waive it. If we are to assimilate them because of an obligation under which we rest to them, they must be allowed to discharge us. Annexation, absorption, or assimilation they do not desire.

We stand in a singular position before the world, and those of us who are opposed to the new dispensation and policy are blamed in some quarters. It is said we complicate matters by delay. But we delay nothing. We decline to subscribe to a policy which we think means dishonor. A part of our Army, on board ship, looks upon an island tenanted by people who have been struggling for years, whether they are white or black, poor, good or bad, to establish their own government. We are armed, exchanging glaring

glances. They hardly know what to do. It is said to us, "Ratify the treaty." Suppose we proceed to give to this Administration power outside of the mere military authority now being exercised; what then will be the result? If the natives resist, what will we do? Will we shoot them? If we do not need them, must we take them? Is it our obligation to be unjust or cruel?

I believe that so far as the world at large respecting humanity is concerned we will do more for our own age and for times that are yet to be if we so act as to demonstrate that we are worthy of the great heritage to which we have succeeded. We will, indeed, hold a proud position if we prove that we differ from other nations whose accumulated powers were used for evil, whose rulers, in the midst of the splendors of transitory triumph, assailed the liberties of their fellows. We owe no obligation of that kind. No such crime can we be asked to commit.

We hear much of our destiny, our manifest destiny. What "manifest destiny" can require any man or set of men or any nation to do that which should not be done? Are we destined for turpitude? What is that manifest destiny? Is it to conquer the world? Evidently many so think. Not long ago it was frequently said upon this floor, "wherever the flag is raised there let it float forever." This proposition was so absurd and the statement was so ridiculed here and elsewhere that a distinguished Senator of expansion tendencies informed me recently that the expression was only a figure of speech.

Yet this very phrase has been alluded to as the maxim upon which expansionists rest. Wherever the American flag has been raised, whether rightly or wrongly, whether or not circumstances make it advisable for us to take it down, there it must continue

to wave; that while under it we might conquer, yet we can not without impropriety relieve it from a position where it can not remain but as the symbol and evidence of oppression. That view, I believe, has been abandoned, and we are now told, as I have stated, that the former argument was nothing more than "a figure of speech." Upon many of these "figures" do the arguments of our adversaries rest.

Our trade, we are advised, requires us to go abroad sword in hand, regardless of principle. Let us investigate. From the most selfish standpoint we ought to adhere to our present policy and leave foreign entanglements for our competitors. I do not care, for the sake of this argument, whether the commercial greatness of the United States is due to Republican so-called protection, or to Democratic ideas, or to the natural abilities and the manufacturing and commercial impulses of the race. To whatever it may be due, we enjoy commercial superiority, and under our present system we have acquired this enviable position. We have won it honestly, by patient, intelligent effort. We have obtained it as the result of the splendid standard of efficiency of our labor—the highest in the world—by compensating our toilers most liberally, by availing ourselves of improved methods, by utilizing our resources, and by invading the marts of the world and taking from other nations in the peaceful struggles of the day, not by force, but by brain and brawn, those great advantages which the records of our Treasury Department show are ours.

Without running at all into elaborate figures, I will refer the Senate to the imports and exports of merchandise for the twelve months, in each case commencing in January and ending in December, for the years 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897, and 1898. But I will show in this connection here and now this fact

only, that while in 1893 our exports exceeded our imports a little less than \$100,000,000—ninety-nine million dollars and odd—in 1894 they rose to \$148,000,000, in 1895 dropped down to \$23,000,000, in 1896 rose to \$324,000,000, in 1897 to \$357,000,000, and in 1898 we exported \$621,000,000 more than we imported.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF MERCHANDISE FOR THE YEARS
1893 TO 1898.

	Twelve months ending December—	Imports.	Exports.	Excess of exports.
1893.....		\$776,248,924	\$876,148,781	\$99,899,857
1894.....		676,312,941	825,102,248	148,789,307
1895.....		801,669,347	824,860,136	23,190,789
1896.....		681,579,556	1,005,837,241	324,257,685
1897.....		742,595,229	1,099,709,045	357,113,816
1898.....		633,664,634	1,254,925,169	621,260,535

Why is all this? Take our consular reports, Senators, and examine them, especially those issued during the last few years, and you will find that American enterprise and American ingenuity are compelling attention everywhere. You will find evidences to this effect in the heart of enterprising Germany, in the center of enlightened England, in the midst of cultivated France. You encounter such manifestations everywhere, and day by day, hour by hour, as our people are better understood and their skill and the merits of their goods more accurately estimated, and as we become more careful regarding our consuls and the retention of those who know something about their business, our trade expands.

We appropriate by these civilized methods the profits heretofore enjoyed by other countries. We are drawing these vast benefits to our pockets. We are becoming great. No little area is ours. Our domain is mighty. This is not a nation to be held in the hollow of even the imperialistic hand. With a population less than one-fourth per square mile of that of the islands of the Philippine group which I first

enumerated, with vast territory yet untouched, with boundless resources, susceptible of utilization and destined for our benefit and for that of our posterity—with all of these great advantages, this glorious prospect, this magnificent possibility, at our own doors, under our immediate civilization—should we not hesitate before forming new alliances?

Witness our territorial greatness. Think what we may do when our population is several times its present number. Look at the victories of peace which may be ours, the contests in the courts of honor which we may win, the contributions to civilization which we may furnish! Are not these more worthy prizes than the spoils of war? Our schools and our churches rise in every township, in every spot where mankind throng. In the paths of mining, agriculture, and manufacture, in the domain of science and art mark our success and observe the boundless field. When our future can thus be rationally anticipated, when we are actually about to possess the choicest blessings of the earth, our conquests won without blood and producing treasure—victories gained honestly, the rewards of intelligence, brought forth under the vivifying and electrifying stimulation of free government—when we have thus succeeded in promoting our Republic to its proud and, in a sense, truly imperial position, we are told that we must follow that delusive stranger, “our destiny,” and must depart from our tried and incomparably successful policy—thus adopting that which is destructive to others in preference to that which makes us really great.

Talk about the obligation that we owe to the Philippines, to England, to France, to China, or to any nation or state or set of nations in the world. Do we not owe more to ourselves? Are not those who are near and dear to us—ought not our country to be



A. P. Thorman



Francis G. Newlands.

dearer to us than any momentary triumph or the flitting shouts of the battlefield? Are we to relinquish the substantial and change our century-sanctified plans in a night because our Navy has been victorious, our Army militant in a contest far from equal? Because we fought a war wherein we lost in actual battle (eliminating subsequent sickness and wounded fatalities) 280 men, must we raise great armies and aver "no power can defeat us?" I know that the sword must sometimes be drawn and that many issues are thus solved, and solved well. But the lessons of time admonish us that all combats to the death are irrational. Civilization occasionally springs from the gory field, but I do not wish my nation to participate in any effort that will result in aught but the building up and strengthening of her claim to be the ideal republic—living to spread virtue and freedom by the mild processes of truth and reason.

Who invites us to these new fields of conquest? The nations with whom we have been contending in this peaceful and soon to be determinative struggle; the nations whose manufacturing we are taking away; the nations whose resources are yielding to the policy of this emancipated Government. They seek to allure us, and they display before us the alleged choice blessings, as they call them, of "benevolent assimilation." India is selected as a typical case. In the dull and ambitionless abode of the Hindoo is found convincing proof of crushed manhood. England, the nation with whom we so lately disputed concerning the Monroe doctrine, is now our mentor and example. Why this sudden change? Is it rational? I want none of this. I know it is not always popular to seek to restrain the impetuous march of those who see or think they see glory ahead, but I believe it is the duty

of men situated as we are to look upon this grave situation calmly and considerately.

I read an article in a newspaper recently to the effect that our Government has agreed to a treaty or compact with Spain, and that the United States can not afford to recede; that Senators who are not expansionists are not cast in patriotic mold. Such impudence does not frighten me from duty. Has it come to this that a treaty, when signed by the Executive, is thereafter the supreme law of the land, or is it still well to obtain the concurrence of the Senate of the United States, and is there any less responsibility upon the Senate in connection with the treaty than there is upon the President?

May this body advise and consent when the Constitution so ordains? When this annexation experiment shall have been tried, if tried it must be, and when its issue for weal or woe has passed into a demonstration, will not this body share and must it not share equally with the Executive in whatever may have transpired? Was it not thought by the men who conceived the Constitution that the Senate of the United States might occasionally contribute an idea in addition to those of Executive discovery, however able, honest, and intelligent the Executive might be?

We are bound to examine this for ourselves. We can not rest upon any examination by anybody else. No one has a higher regard for the ability of the three members of this body who went abroad on this treaty mission than have I. This treaty is to a large extent their work, and we are in the presence, therefore, of men who understand more about it than we do. This, however, can have no influence upon us, except in so far as reasons may be furnished and arguments adduced controlling our judgment and discretion.

We must satisfy ourselves, I repeat, and that we

will do so I have no reason to doubt. This is not assumption, it is the performance of a duty. Whatever may be the personal effect of blending Executive and Senatorial functions in a treaty commissioner, the organic laws can not thus be altered.

Will anyone tell me that a great standing army is advisable in a republic? What is the inevitable and necessary consequence of the carrying out of this modern doctrine of expansion? It will not rest its influence upon the Philippines only. When we place our giant foot upon those islands, we will seek new scenes for aggression and conquest and will consider that it is our duty to encircle the earth.

What is the limit of the expansionist? Where does he stop? It is hinted that our more progressive legislators and citizens hope to participate in the partition of China. Whenever there is to be an "absorption," which is a modern expression for international robbery, the advocates of the new idea wish to be present. The old days, when upon the Fourth of July and other festivities the school-boy talked about the outrages involved in the partition of Poland, will not come again. The custom of reading Washington's Farewell Address here will soon be abandoned if this fallacious doctrine obtains. The sarcastic irrelevancy of that great announcement will be apparent to the most unlettered and expansive mind.

We have bills for the increase of our Navy, and I am in favor of a fine naval establishment—sufficient to guard our interests thoroughly, but not to engage in conquest. We are informed that these expenditures will aggregate millions, and yet we have only commenced. Oh, you can not in a moment lead a free people from the pathway of virtue which from the teachings of their mothers' knee they learned to tread.

The allurements and deceptions from which nations

and individuals alike suffer do not ordinarily mean the immediate avoidance of honor. The gradual moving away from the old road finally results in its abandonment. The way of truth is left untrodden. Upon it grow weeds and thistles. Its identity is now and then pointed out by someone who lingers on the scene—a lone worshiper yet at liberty's shrine.

It is an army of a hundred thousand men, or 60,000 men now. It will be 120,000 in a short time. And why not? This vast host will be necessary. Nay, several times more. I do not speak of this enormous augmentation of our military as any act of oppression upon the part of those who recommend it, or upon the part of those who may vote the appropriations, but I speak of it, sir, as the inevitable and necessary consequence of the adoption of a policy which recognizes the arbitrament of the sword and the settlement of disputes not in peace, but in war. We are preparing for not merely a war, but for wars.

Then will come a time when the military will dominate the land and when the Republic will endure only in story and in song.

How long would it have been necessary to combat such a policy had it been advocated but a little time ago? Is it not singular that as matters proceed we become more and more acclimated, as it were, to this situation; we more readily yield up and sacrifice really precious things and join the majority in saying that after all the Constitution is of no great force, and that if, as a distinguished military man has lately said, it is not in accordance with our new demands and developments, we can get something else? And so we can; we may abandon the basic principles of this Government. We (I speak of the people) have the power to do so. The nations have so acted in many an age. Can we not, too, be foolish? I have

considered it less important to discuss the actual words of the Constitution than to combat this destructive tendency.

What does this enormous armed display mean? We familiarize the people with the presence of war. We look at Article III of the amendments of the Constitution and we wonder why, after all, there was so much said about the quartering of troops. Of whom were the fathers afraid? They feared the armies, whose business was not of peace. They knew much of the arrogance of soldiery. They appreciated the impossibility of preserving liberty in the face of mighty standing armies. They knew that the honest civilian must yield, and they searched history in vain to learn that there was any compatibility between a standing army and free institutions.

And hence, if there is one thing that we have all learned, Democrats, Republicans, and Populists alike, it is that, save in a great public exigency, we ought not to have among us, and upon us, and of us, large bodies of armed men. And yet we are bringing about a condition which will necessitate this calamity. We are creating, by this annexation program, the very condition which we concede and have always conceded to be eminently disastrous.

Consider the state of a people who are pursuing peace, who are not familiar with war, but who are ready to instantly spring to arms to defend their rights and honor, and to preserve their nation from injustice—consider such a people abandoning the tenets of civilization and adopting the business of carnage. Are we ready to call this progress?

Because I consider this particular subject of a great deal of importance—that while I am opposed, for reasons which I have stated, to the entire scheme, while my objections are so absolutely basic that I have

no idea that the proposition will ever receive my vote in any of its forms, nevertheless, if it be true, as contended by the Senator from Colorado and no doubt believed by him, that we intend to treat the people of the Philippine Islands as we intend to treat the people of Cuba, let us make a record which hereafter will not be evidence against the insistence of that intent.

For instance, we have declared our intention regarding Cuba. It is proposed by the resolution offered by the Senator from Georgia that we shall declare our intention regarding the Philippines. If we do not do that, it will be considered that that proposition has been answered in the negative.

Then the treaty itself declares that while the title to Cuba is relinquished, that to the Philippines is ceded. I imagine that before accepting title to anything, before we consider it as a relinquishment or a cession, it is better to know our actual desires. When the cession is completed, the grant absolutely made, the power entirely exercised, and this resolution tabled or laid aside or forgotten for the time being, then the question must be, how will we get rid of our investment? It is better to deliberate now upon the disposition of this territory that future complications may be avoided. The cession is not yet complete. The Senate must act first.

I am unwilling to leave this resolution to be passed on hereafter, for I know it will be in the hands of some, whom I am personally aware are antagonistic to anything save permanent retention. They will prevent its consideration at all, and I therefore insist that if it is in good faith intended to treat Cuba and the Philippines alike, let the record so show.

I do not see either that the mere reference in the ninth article of the pending treaty to the native inhabitants of the territories and the provision that Con-

gress shall determine the citizen status interferes with my position. On the contrary, this recital presupposes that Congress will legislate with reference to these acquisitions as though the cession were perfect.

I have attempted briefly to give some of the reasons which appear to me controlling against the making of this treaty. I have not dwelt upon the threatened abandonment of the Monroe doctrine, nor have I shown, as I might, the difficulties of colonial government in the tropics by any government. I find no embarrassment in solving the situation, bad as it is, upon lines heretofore indicated. Spain and all other nations can be warned off and a local government can be established. I see no want of dignity upon the part of the United States in insisting that as far as the Philippine Islands are concerned they shall be treated as Cuba is treated. If it be said that we have our commissioners, I answer that we should act under our constitutional authority and to the best of our ability. That this does not imply discredit, but only implies regardfulness of duty.

These questions, I take it, must be determined from some other standpoint than that of individual preference. Those of us who believe that a new, untried, and dangerous policy is about to be inaugurated can not find any answer in the assertion that we have appropriated other and more congenial territory, areas fitted for civilization and easy of access and free from a dangerous and permanently nonassimilative population. Never before did we seek a distant sea and an Oriental land, tenanted by millions who are not of us and who deny our authority. I am not attracted by the colonial experiences of the world.

Spain herself believed in expansion. Imperialism brought her down.

In these days when military power and splendor

engross so much attention, at this time when all over the world are repeated the stories of American valor, now when the youth turns with aspiring eye toward the gratification of his ambition to the tented field, when the soldier and the sailor rejoice in their great accomplishments, it is well for us to look back—to reflect. The fathers of the Republic had studied the history of mankind. They read from the standpoint of threatened liberty. They deliberated from the vantage ground of disinterested honesty. They fought, too, in vindication of their opinions. Their life terms were not less than those of this generation.

Greater men have not been here. These statesmen were well aware that other nations had been free and that in the days of frugality and honesty they were happy and prosperous and soon became strong. They knew that republicanism in its purity must ever beget power and affluence and that nations as well as individuals are often seduced by the lavish offerings of ambition to attempt military despotism and to regard as ill suited the safe teachings of less flattering hours.

They were profoundly versed in the narrations which told of the rise and fall of people—the sacrifices of independence—the terrors of corruption and decay. Shall we not heed their admonitions? Are we too wise to regard them? Can we credit the promise that imperialism will benefit the cause of freedom? The world saw upon Helena's lonely rock the greatest soldier, perhaps, of all history. When his life's race had nearly run, he who too had believed himself a man of destiny, gazing upon the glistening sea which guarded his restless spirit, said, almost with his dying breath, that the world would never know what he had in store for man.

In the seven-hilled city more than once the tyrant with bloody sword uplifted claimed the blessings of

posterity. The glorious court of Fontainebleau was refulgent with a brightness which indicated the effort of power to conceal a condition which eventuated in a culmination which threatened the thrones of the Old World.

The United States will never be too prosperous or strong to adhere to constitutional restraints and to work out its mission with the aid of intelligent and honest men. It is in the hope that we may aid to preserve forever stainless in its purity and unconquerable in its integrity the Republic of our fathers that I register here my protest against what I conceive to be a disastrous innovation.

CHAPTER XX.

LARGE STANDING ARMIES A MENACE TO A REPUBLIC.

BY HON. ARTHUR P. GORMAN,

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MARYLAND.

I have not consumed much of the time of the Senate in the discussion of the pending resolutions. I have had no intention of doing so, and would not now but for the occurrences of the last two days in this chamber. The remarks of the Senator from Nebraska, who addressed the Senate this morning, in connection with the remarks made by the Senator from Colorado seem to make it necessary that I should say one word before we shall have entered upon the real consideration of the treaty in secret session.

It has grown to be an unfortunate custom that the newspaper criticisms of public men find ready conduits in this body, so that their utterances may be recorded here upon our records. No matter how severe the criticism, how unjust the comment, it seems that at times they are to find their way into this body and to be repeated by honorable members of the Senate.

My attitude upon this treaty was well defined in a public utterance before the treaty was negotiated so far as it refers to the acquisition of the Philippine Islands. My opinion upon that question was known and freely expressed by me to one of the commissioners who negotiated the treaty before he left this country for Paris. I have had no cause to change the opinions then expressed publicly and privately. They were opinions formed after mature deliberation; opinions that I be-

lied were in the best interests of my country; opinions to be maintained by me, no matter what the influence may be upon the other side.

In my course in public life Presidents of the United States and their cabinets have had no terrors for me. I have opposed them when they were of my own political faith, when I believed that the measures presented were too extreme and would put in jeopardy the business interests of the American people. I oppose this treaty in the form in which it comes to us, and under which we are to acquire the sovereignty of the Philippine Archipelago, filled with people who never can assimilate with us, because I believe its adoption and the acquisition of the territory would be more disastrous to my country than any other measure which has come before the Congress of the United States or the Senate of the United States from the formation of the Government to this hour.

The Senator from Colorado, in his carefully prepared speech, as I take it, after having described the conditions attending the consideration of the treaty, said:

Bar England, there is not a country in Europe that is not hostile to us. During all this war they stood in sullen hate, hoping for our defeat and that disaster might come to us; and to-day they wait with eager and rapacious gaze, hoping that some event may yet prevent our reaping the fruits of the treaty which has been agreed upon by the commissioners of the two countries. Yet, while this critical condition of affairs exists, it has become evident within the last few days that certain political leaders in this chamber believe that a new issue should be brought before the American people to be determined at the next Presidential election. They intend that the American people shall be called upon to pass on the questions arising out of the war, and that this shall be the issue of the next campaign.

For one, I believe that issue a fair one, and I am ready, as all good citizens ought to be, to meet the views of the whole American people upon the question of the conduct of the war, of its achievements, and of the policy this country should pursue at its close. But it is deplorable that in formulating such an issue and in pursuit of such a policy those leaders should find it necessary to seek to dishonor this Government and the administration which has guided us so wisely through the troubled sea of international complications and brought us to the threshold of an honorable peace; that they should seek to degrade us in the face of the nations of the world; and that they should attempt to bring about some fancied political advantage by an effort to defeat the ratification of a treaty which, if unratified, must bring back a condition of war as it existed before the report of the commissioners, passive it may be, but full of uncertainty and full of disaster to the interests and the welfare of our country.

I suppose that a fair judgment and a charitable judgment would enable me to say that the Senator from Colorado alone, of all the Senators in this body, is the only one capable of such an utterance when we are considering such a great question.

Aspirations of public men amount to but little. That the political desire for preferment of any man would control his vote upon this treaty is inconceivable to me, and he who entertains such an idea is on a very low plane in the consideration of a measure so grave.

I believe in parties. I believe in my party, because I believe that the interests of the people will be best served in the end by its promotion to power and its control of governmental affairs. I adhered to it when some of its doctrines were very far from meeting with my approval, because I have believed that in the main the interests of the country would be better subserved through it.

Away beyond office, away beyond personal desire of promotion of any sort, stands the great question we are facing. On yesterday, Sunday, the cable flashed the news that because of the attitude of the American Republic in their determination, in their effort, in their threat to take possession of a people who did not desire to become a part of the nation the blood of American citizens had flowed. Those natives, fighting for their liberty as they understand it, made an attack upon the American army.

Who believes for a moment that if there was a provision in the pending treaty like the one relating to Cuba that our occupation would be only temporary, that it is only intended to aid them to form a better government to control their own affairs, that there would have been a single life lost? They would have submitted as Gomez has submitted, and turned their army as allies and supporters of the American flag,

which would, under that condition, give them liberty and freedom.

I believe that if the pending treaty is ratified and we obtain a cession of the sovereignty of those islands, it will be only the beginning of a war that will cost us hundreds, yes, thousands, of lives of our splendid specimens of intelligent young manhood and millions and millions of money, and that when we shall have, as we will, driven them at the point of the bayonet to submit to the authority of the American nation, with all the accompanying destruction of property and lives, the whole archipelago will then be a pest to the American Union. I believe that it will open the door for a flow from the Chinese Empire and from the islands themselves of a host of men, untold in numbers, who will not assimilate with, but will tend to degrade, the American people.

Do you remember—I do—that it was but ten years ago that this great American nation, with all its power, when two great political parties were lining up in the Presidential battle of 1888, was compelled by the working people, the men who are engaged in trades, the men who are engaged in labor, to abrogate a treaty with China which permitted the Chinese to come in? Only a few hundred thousand had come in on the Pacific coast, yet the feeling against them was so intense that both political parties were forced to declare against their further entry. I think it the most remarkable chapter in the history of the country and the only instance of the abrogation of a treaty by statute. While we were negotiating with China, a friendly nation, with which we were at peace, for a modification of the treaty negotiated by Mr. Seward in 1868, both parties were absolutely driven, so powerful was the feeling of the laboring people of the country to pass an act of Congress which abrogated the treaty without

giving the friendly nation an opportunity for consideration.

We made that restriction and destroyed our trade with China. They submitted to it as no other nation on the earth would have submitted to it. Our trade, however, melted away until it has run down to almost nothing as compared with that of Great Britain, France and Germany. And now ten years after that act we propose to take islands that are in front of the China Sea. No nation on earth can guard them. No power is strong enough to prevent the Chinese from going over and obtaining a lodgment; and then it is a stepping-stone by which they will come to the United States, because when the islands are annexed the inhabitants become American citizens. You can not keep the Chinese out to-day with all the police power of the Government. You can not prevent their entry from Canada and from Mexico. It will not, in my judgment, be four years, if this treaty is ratified, before the American people will act as they did in 1888. I am not an alarmist, nor have I a desire to throw out a suggestion of disorder, but, judging from the past, our people will resent it.

I assume it is believed by the authors of this measure that the people will resent it; and hence you propose to provide for it by increasing the Army to be kept at home a hundred thousand men, at a cost of \$100,000,000 a year, not alone to take care of our affairs in those distant islands, but as a police force to help to control the American people.

This is possibly the last time I may address the Senate upon this subject, and I now enter my solemn protest against it. I want to see this great Government march on for all time, as it has in the past, relying upon the good will and good sense of the American

people to support and protect their Government without the aid of armies.

I fear armies at home. I witnessed the great struggle of the war between the States which closed in 1865. Since its close I have seen a great army used in part to control the sovereign States of the Union. I also witnessed the patriotic and manly efforts of the great captain of our armies, General Grant, and of that fearless volunteer soldier, Gen. John A. Logan, of Illinois, and of Benjamin F. Butler, of Massachusetts, both members of the House, who raised their voices, as all statesmen had done in the past, and favored the reduction of the Army to 30,000 men, when their own country, one-third of it, was in a state of unrest. I want to follow in their lead—a lead which makes it impossible to govern the American people by bayonets.

The spectacle has just been presented of the President of the United States, kindly, manly, partisan as he has always been, in his tour through the Southern country, preaching good will and kindness to all who inhabit that section of our common land, giving them full credit for their patriotism in this war, as he ought to have done, and making the kindly suggestion that the time had passed when there should be any distinction between the care of the graves of the Confederate dead and those of the Union soldiers. His sentiments are noble and magnanimous. But when you couple with them his other insistence, both public and private, that we must have 100,000 soldiers and a navy as large as France or Germany, how can his suggestion—honestly made, I admit—to the Southern people that the Government take care of the graves of their ancestors be otherwise interpreted than also meaning, "You must give me 100,000 men to keep in order their descendants who are living?"

From the whole transaction I shrink; from the whole transaction, in the interest of the people of the American Union, as I see their interests, I protest; for, I repeat, I believe the absorption of the inhabitants of these islands would be more disastrous than the war from 1861 to 1865 so far as the material interests of the country are concerned. I think it would be more disastrous than the picture drawn by the Senator from Virginia of the great misfortune which came to us by the injection into our body politic of the slave, against the protest of Virginia, and because of which the whole land was deluged in blood and brother turned against brother.

To Virginia this country owes a debt of gratitude. From the days of Patrick Henry until the speech of the Senator from Virginia on my left, Virginia has always voiced the true American sentiment, which, if adhered to, will bring prosperity and glory to our common country.

CHAPTER XXI.

A NATION'S POWER.

BY HON. HENRY M. TELLER,

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM COLORADO.

The power of acquisition of territory, as I said in June last when addressing the Senate, is a prerogative of nationality, and there is no provision of the Constitution that authorizes the Government of the United States to acquire either Cuba or Porto Rico except as it may be found in the power to declare and carry on war, and through the great prerogative of national sovereignty, a power that has never been denied to any nation in the history of the world, the power of acquisition.

I shall not attempt to go into a discussion of this question. I suppose the Senator from Missouri would say we are a nation, but that we are a nation with limited powers. The Supreme Court of the United States said, and it is an elementary principle, that a sovereign power can be limited only by its own act. If there is any limitation upon our power as a sovereign it must be found in the Constitution of the United States. We might have limited our power; we might have declared that we possessed not the power that other nations did. But we did not. The founders of the Republic did not mean to say that this great nation, then perhaps small, but in their expectation to be great, could not do as a nation what other nations did, or what other nations claimed the right to

do, and might find necessary to do in the interest of the people. The only restriction or limitation on the exercise of national prerogatives is with reference to our internal or domestic affairs. In that respect the United States is a nation of limited and defined powers, to be found in the Constitution.

The power of acquiring territory has been repeatedly declared by the Supreme Court to belong to us. We have exercised it. We have exercised it without special provisions of the Constitution. Jefferson doubted very much whether we had the power. The contemporaneous opinion of statesmen was against him. Occasionally one believed we had the power to take territory and not the power to admit it as a State. Such was the declaration of a number of statesmen at the time of the acquisition of Louisiana. It does not appear from what I can learn that Jefferson doubted our authority to make a State of territory if he was satisfied we had the power to acquire it. Whatever doubts there might have been then as to that, they were put at rest when we accepted the purchase of Louisiana and when we incorporated that territory into different States of the Union.

The Supreme Court of the United States have said in many opinions, and by the very best men who sat upon that bench, including Chief Justice Marshall, that our right to govern was unquestioned and unlimited and unrestricted by the Constitution of the United States. We may give to them just such a government as we think they deserve. We may give them a government in which they are allowed to participate, or we may deny to them any participation in the affairs of the government under which they live.

In volume 130, United States Reports, pages 603, 604, and 605, Judge Field said:

Jurisdiction over its own territory to that extent is an incident of every independent nation. It is a part of its independence. If it could not exclude aliens it would be to that extent subject to the control of another power. As said by this court in the case of *The Exchange* (7 Cranch, 116, 136), speaking by Chief Justice Marshall:

"The jurisdiction of the nation within its own territory is necessarily exclusive and absolute.

"It is susceptible of no limitation not imposed by itself. Any restriction upon it deriving validity from an external source would imply a diminution of its sovereignty to the extent of the restriction, and an investment of that sovereignty to the same extent in that power which could impose such restriction. All exceptions, therefore, to the full and complete power of a nation within its own territories must be traced up to the consent of the nation itself. They can flow from no other legitimate source.

"While under our Constitution and form of government the great mass of local matters is controlled by local authorities, the United States, in their relation to foreign countries and their subjects or citizens, are one nation invested with powers which belong to independent nations, the exercise of which can be invoked in the maintenance of its absolute independence and security throughout its entire territory."

In *6 Wheaton*, pages 264 and 413, the court said:

That the United States form, for many and for most important purposes, a single nation has not yet been denied. In war we are one people. In making peace we are one people. In all commercial regulations we are one and the same people. In many other respects the American people are one; and the Government, which is alone capable of controlling and managing their interests in all these respects, is the Government of the Union. It is their Government, and in that character they have no other.

America has chosen to be in many respects, and to many purposes, a nation; and for all these purposes her Government is complete; to all these objects it is competent. The people have declared that in the exercise of all powers given for these objects it is supreme. It can, then, in effecting these objects, legitimately control all individuals or governments within the American territory. The Constitution and laws of a State, so far as they are repugnant to the Constitution and laws of the United States, are absolutely void. These States are constituent parts of the United States. They are members of one great empire—for some purposes sovereign, for some purposes subordinate.

Justice Matthews, in *Murphy vs. Ramsey*, 114 *United States Reports*, said:

The counsel for the appellants in argument seemed to question the constitutional power of Congress to pass the act of March 22, 1882, so far as it abridges the rights of electors in the Territory under previous laws. But that question is, we think, no longer open to discussion. It has passed beyond the state of controversy into final judgment. The people of the United States, as sovereign owners of the national Territories, have supreme power over them and their inhabitants.

Supreme power of the United States must exclude all other power.

Mr. Justice Bradley, in the opinion of the court in the case of *Mormon Church vs. United States*, 136 *United States Reports*, page 42, said:

The power to acquire territory, other than the territory northwest of the Ohio River (which belonged to the United States at the adoption of the Constitution), is derived from the treaty-making power and the power to declare and carry on war. The incidents of these powers are those of national sovereignty, and belong to all independent governments. The power to make acquisitions of territory by conquest, by treaty, and by cession is an incident of national sovereignty. The Territory of Louisiana, when acquired from France, and the Territories west of the Rocky Mountains, when acquired from Mexico, became the absolute property and domain of the United States, subject to such conditions as the Government, in its diplomatic negotiations, had seen fit to accept relating to the rights of the people then inhabiting those Territories. Having rightly acquired said Territories, the United States Government was the only one which could impose laws upon them, and its sovereignty over them was complete.

No State of the Union had any such right of sovereignty over them; no other country or government had any such right. These propositions are so elementary, and so necessarily follow from the condition of things arising upon the acquisition of new territory, that they need no argument to support them. They are self-evident. Chief Justice Marshall, in the case of the American Insurance Company vs. Canter (1 Pet., 511, 542), well said: "Perhaps the power of governing a Territory belonging to the United States which has not, by becoming a State, acquired the means of self-government, may result necessarily from the facts that it is not within the jurisdiction of any particular State and is within the power and jurisdiction of the United States. The right to govern may be the inevitable consequence of the right to acquire territory. Whichever may be the source whence the power is derived, the possession of it is unquestioned."

I will admit it is the moral duty and that there is an obligation upon the people of the United States in their legislation with reference to these countries to keep in mind the fundamental principle which underlies free government and without which free government can not exist, a principle so often quoted by the Senator from Missouri, and a principle that can not be too often quoted, "that the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed."

I do not mean to say that we may not disregard that, and that we could not administer government in these new possessions of ours in violation of that principle, but that in accordance with the great fundamental principles that permeate and underlie republican institutions and dominate the mind of Republicans everywhere, we ought not to forget that the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed, and it is our duty to secure to these people just such political rights and privileges as they

are entitled to under our system. That must be determined by their condition.

The doctrine that the consent of the governed is essential in a republican government has many exceptions. We do not in the United States, with all our boasted freedom, allow everybody to participate in the affairs of government. We exclude the alien, we exclude the ignorant and vicious, we exclude women and infants—rightfully, because the principle that the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed has always been received everywhere with exceptions. There is no government in the world, and there never has been one, founded upon a strict observance of that declaration, and there can not be.

Why? Because the interests of the few must give way to the interests of the great mass; because it might be dangerous to the body politic to allow a certain class to participate in the affairs of the government. The disabilities that exist must be disabilities that render them unfit and unsuitable for the discharge of political duties, or else they ought not to be excluded. Such a rule must be applied to everybody subject to such disabilities. We can not allow one citizen with disabilities to participate and another with the same disabilities to be excluded.

One of the declarations of a free people is that there must be no taxation without representation, and yet every day in this country and in every other where this doctrine is recognized we see people paying taxes without representation. We see women paying taxes and infants paying taxes and foreigners paying taxes, and yet we do not understand that it is a violation of that fundamental principle, because everybody should recognize the exceptions.

Now, we are coming to deal with the greatest question, in my opinion, that the American people have dealt with since the contest of 1861. I have more confidence in the good sense of the American people than to believe we are about to adopt a policy in dealing with these countries that threatens the death of the Republic or even great danger to it.

In the first place, I believe to-day that we are hardly prepared to pass upon what ought to be the character of government that we establish over these countries.

I am not one of those who would turn these islands back to Spain; I am not one who would give them up to any other nation in the world; nor would I give them up to the people of those countries under present conditions. I believe we went into this war in the interest of human freedom, in the interest of good government; that we went into it as no other people in the history of the world ever went into a war. We have stood before the world presenting a spectacle and an example unheard of in history, ready to pour out our money and sacrifice life in the interest of those strangers.

We can not stop. We commenced this great work of humanity, and we are bound to carry it on until we have accomplished the great object for which we began. We can not do it by turning over to those people the government of these various countries, in my judgment, in the present disorganized condition of affairs there; but we ought to keep in view all the time that some day these people are to be self-reliant and self-governing, as we are, or they are to become a part and parcel of this Republic, entitled to all the rights and subject to all the duties of citizenship of States.

Which shall it be? As they are now, nobody wants

to take them into the body politic. Nobody wants to make Cuba or Porto Rico or the Philippines States of the Union. I do not believe any portion of the people of the United States are willing to say that these possessions shall be created States and admitted into the Union now. And yet, in the course of time, if they shall become fitted, they may become States and admitted into the Union.

As I look upon it, we have a great obligation resting upon us. We are on trial. Are we going to be able to handle this question safely for ourselves and safely for the people whose interests we started out to protect? I will admit that that is a difficult question, and if I should now outline at this moment my idea of what ought to be the policy of the Government it may be, and very likely will be, subject to change when we are better informed about those people. But there are some underlying principles which we must keep in view, and one of those is that we can not govern these colonies, these provinces, as England governs India; we may govern them as England governs Canada and her other English-speaking colonies. What shall be the policy must depend largely, in my judgment, upon the character of the people with whom we are to deal. I think in the island of Cuba, with a little assistance from the Government of the United States, there can be established a government of proper character to take care of all the local interests of that country.

I confess that I am not willing to see the people of Cuba to-day turned out to take care of themselves so far as international affairs are concerned. I should be afraid of interference by some foreign power with that new government. I think we should say to the world, and say it so that all could understand it: We

intend to give to those people, so far as it can be done, self-government; but we do not intend that they shall become the prey, either by conquest or by treaty, of any foreign power. In all their international relations I believe, for many years to come at least, the Government of the United States must speak to the world for Cuba.

It is not necessary that we invite every man in Cuba to participate in the government that we there establish. We have the right to see that they exclude from participation in that government such elements as we know would render the government unstable and unsafe, or else do it ourselves. If those people are able to maintain a government of the character I have mentioned without our assistance, which secures to the people all the blessings and averts all the evils which governments among men are instituted to secure and to avert, then we should let them do so in all their local affairs.

The statement that we can not have colonies, that we can not enter upon the imperialism of Europe, I believe is idle, for I do not think that any considerable number of the American people or any considerable number of men in public life propose to adopt the system which Great Britain adopted with reference to her early colonies, and which she abandoned more than a hundred years ago as to her English-speaking colonies after she had received a lesson in dealing with us. I do not think the American people will believe in holding these islands for the purpose of making money out of them, as the French are holding some portions of China and some portions of Africa.

The American people are not engaged in this effort for the 5 per cent or the 10 per cent or any other per cent that is coming to them. They are engaged in it

in the interest of good government; they believe that putting up and keeping up the flag of this country over our new possessions will do for those people what the English flag did for us when it brought to us English common law and English jurisprudence and English freedom. They believe the American flag is capable of giving to those people American law, American freedom, American progress, and enabling them to share in prosperity with us as well as in American glory.

There will be no harm done if the American flag floats there as an emblem of national power, keeping always in view that it is not to float over slaves or subjugated people; but every citizen of this great Republic may not be entitled to all the rights of the citizenship of a State and yet entitled to the benefit of these great principles—liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Keeping that in view, the American flag will be a blessing wherever it floats. It never has been a curse and it never will be a curse to any people, for there will be no colonial system under it such as England has applied to India. There will be no “imperialism” under it.

I have said repeatedly that I thought we ought not to deal with this question until we properly reach it, and I would have been willing to do that but for the repeated declarations of prominent men in public life that we who did not believe that the Government of the United States lacked the power to acquire territory, that we who did not believe that the American flag, having on it the insignia of government, should come down until we replaced it with something equally good, wanted to establish in these new possessions the colonial system of Europe, with all its

evils, with all its vices, with all its cruelty to the people to whom it is applied. We do not want that.

If you could poll the American people, you would not find 1 per cent of them who want to do that; and if you should take the vote now you would not find 1 per cent of them who believe it will not be better for these new possessions of ours that our flag shall float over them, not simply as the emblem of power, but as the emblem of good government, of protection to them, as it is protection to us.

Why can we not take this position before the world? It is in accordance with our declaration, solemnly made by the two Houses of Congress, with the approval of the President, that this was not a war of conquest. When we had conquered the Philippines, and when we might have properly demanded of Spain indemnity, we turned around and we gave to Spain \$20,000,000. Why? I do not know. But I assume that we gave it to her as we gave \$15,000,000 to Mexico when we conquered her territory and when she lay bleeding at our feet, when we might have taken every foot of that country and made it ours, in accordance with international law; and we should have done it if we had been ruled and moved by the spirit which actuates most nations of the world.

We said to her, prostrate as she was, "We want some of your territory, and we are willing to pay for it; we will give you \$15,000,000." And we gave it. We held that territory, first, by conquest and, then, by purchase; and such a purchase had never before been made in the history of national acquirements, unless it was in the case of the Louisiana purchase, which made it possible that the last Mexican purchase should be accomplished.

What has it brought to us? Wealth untold, an em-

pire in extent. We took it with clean hands. No matter what might have been said or might have been believed of the provocation of the war with Mexico; no matter what people might have thought of our haste to begin that war, or our object, everybody in the world must have admitted that we dealt with Mexico as became a great and generous people. So we have dealt with Spain in giving her \$20,000,000—a bagatelle, a mere nothing. These possessions are ours by conquest, by purchase, by right. We could not give them up if we would.

If one-half of the people of Luzon are capable—I believe more than that number are capable to-day—of managing their affairs in a fairly good condition, I would say to them: This is the line that we think your government should be inaugurated upon; and then I would ask them to inaugurate a government in entire accordance with republican sentiment and republican principles. I am aware that they know nothing about free government. I am aware that they are incapable of establishing, without our advice, without our moral support, and possibly without our physical support, a government such as we should be willing to see established in those islands—a government which would give protection to person and property and ultimately lift those people up to a higher plane than they now occupy.

I do not believe that they can manage a government like that which is maintained in some of the States of this Union, or, I may say, in all of the States of this Union; but here is a fundamental truth recognized in republican government, that a people are entitled only to such government as they can maintain. Any government which they can maintain, which brings order and peace to the people, is the government which

they have the right to have and ought to have, and we have no right to interfere and say to them, "Unless you can maintain a better government than you now have, one as good as ours, you must let us manage your affairs, and we will give you a better government." A government of the people and by the people may not always be the highest order of government, but if it brings peace and protection to the people, and is the best they can do, it is all that we can demand of them.

I believe we have a great obligation resting upon us, which is to help these people. I know the danger and the trouble of dealing with tropical people. I know that there has never been in a tropical country a government such as we believe ought to exist, and I am of the opinion that there never will be one that will come up to our idea of government. The people who live in the Tropics are not qualified, and, I fear, never will be qualified to maintain such a government as is maintained by Anglo-Saxon people. A torrid climate does not develop high mental or moral qualities. Yet we can not say to them, "You can not have a government of your own choice and of your own creating;" for if we do, then we abandon the great doctrine of republics, which is that the people are entitled to make their own government.

I am not dealing with this question believing that we are not to have embarrassment, that we are not to have trouble. I know we shall have, but I do not believe we should shrink from our duty because there may be difficulties attending it. It may cost us some money; but it has cost us already at least \$300,000,000, and it has cost us two or three thousand lives. It may cost us as much more. We entered upon this war with deliberation. It was the American people

who made this war; it was not the Administration; it was not the Senate; it was not the House of Representatives; it was the American people who demanded that we should intervene in the interests of the downtrodden in Cuba; and when eight or ten millions more of men under like circumstances fall under our control, we can not avoid our duty by saying, "We went to war to help Cuba. We will help nobody else." That is cowardly. We can not do it. We are big enough and rich enough to carry on this great work in the interest of freedom without counting the expense. It is too late to do that now. All we need to consider is how can we do this work without injury to ourselves and a blessing to these people.

That is the principle which ought to animate the American Senate and the American House and the American people. I would say to the inhabitants of these new possessions, "If you can maintain a government of order for your local affairs, you shall be allowed to do it." I should say to them in addition, "We will, for your good, stand between you and the European powers, who would appropriate your country and would inaugurate a system of colonial dependence such as England has in India and such as Spain has maintained over you, and we will see that no foreign power interferes with you;" and to do that, we must say to them, "If you wish to speak to the world on foreign affairs you must speak through us." We may call it a protectorate or we may call it what we please. I would stand back of these people and help them, help to give to them a government that will secure to them the blessings of liberty, and help them to solve the great questions which are presented to them as a free people, for that is what we have got to make them.

I never look for and never expect to find in a tropical country a government like unto ours. It is not in the nature of things that there should be. The Asiatic will never maintain such a government as the Anglo-Saxon. He is not capable of it, and wedded as he is to traditions, seeing only good in that which has gone before, he does not make an effort to improve, as the Anglo-Saxon does.

Yet, by daily contact with the duties of manhood and citizenship, he is progressing gradually, and there is hope for improvement, even in the tropical world. There is hope for the people in the Philippines, who are infinitely better to-day than they were when Spain went there. I mean more intelligent and capable of self-government. Notwithstanding the oppressions of Spain and the outrages inflicted upon them for two hundred years, they have made progress. They will make more under republican principles if we are wise and deal with them intelligently and justly. As said by that illustrious naval officer, kindness and protection of their interests will bring them into close communion with us. I will not say there will not be any difficulty, but there will be no difficulty that is insurmountable in dealing with them.

We can make a mistake by refusing to do justice to them, and we can have great tribulations brought upon us by so doing. We shall make a mistake if we make up our minds that we are going to govern those people from here; that we are going to govern them with the Anglo-Saxons whom we send out from here to administer the affairs of that country. You will need your 50,000 soldiers, and in a little while you will need more, for they are a great people. They are a people who know something of their rights. They are a people who are willing to contend for them, and

I believe it to be almost an axiom that a people who will fight for their liberty, and who are willing to die for it, are capable of maintaining it when they get it.

I do not want to give up these islands. I do not want to surrender them to anybody in the world. I do not want to govern them in the spirit of the colonial governments of Europe, or as many of them are being carried on. I do not want to give them up, because to give them up would be to leave those people in a worse condition than they were when we took away the power of Spain. We may leave them a prey, perhaps, to their own vices. We leave them to be a prey of all Europe. We must stand for them. We have put up our flag. There it is going to stay.

It is going to stay there for their protection and our glory, for there can be no greater glory coming to any nation in the world than that they should take eight or ten million men, bound down by the power of a wicked government, and lift them up and put them on the plane of citizenship in a great republic and say to them, "So far as is consistent with safety to us, you shall be a part and a parcel of this great people." That does not mean that you must make States of them. It does not mean that you shall give them the elective franchise, but it does mean that you shall give them the protection of the flag; that you shall stand between them and foreign powers; that you shall give them that moral aid, that moral encouragement, which will enable them to take care of themselves.

If there was doubt I would not let constitutional questions prevent us from going on and doing what we started to do. There is no doubt of our power. The way is clear. The power is ample. It is not necessary to make them States. But the question of

statehood will be determined by the character of the men and not by their distance from our shores. I do not believe they will be States ever. The time may come when we can say "Accept full sovereignty. Take care of yourselves. Go to the world and proclaim your nationality, put up your own flag." But they can not do it now. They must have our fostering care for a time, with kindness and justice. The American flag to them should always represent something besides the majesty of this Government. It should represent that always, wherever it floats, but it should represent to those people freedom, protection, participation in the benefits of the greatest and freest people in the world.



Marion Bester



Wm. J. Stone.

CHAPTER XXII.

WHAT WILL THEY DO TO US?

BY HON. GEORGE FRANKLIN EDMUNDS,

EX-UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM VERMONT.

1. These 1,200 islands, more or less, are in the heart of the tropics and occupy a region of seas nearly 1,000 miles long north and south and about 300 miles wide. They are about 7,000 miles distant from our Pacific coast and are about 14,000 miles distant from our Atlantic coast via the Suez Canal, controlled by a foreign power. Only a few of the islands are large enough to play any important part in the problem. These are Luzon, Camarines, Mindoro, Samar, Leyte, Panay, Mindanao and Palawan. The latest encyclopædias estimate the area at about 114,000 square miles and the population at 7,000,000.

2. They have all the climatic evils and diseases of tropical countries and are frequently afflicted by violent hurricanes and earthquakes. They are, as all human experience has proved, absolutely incapable of being colonized and built up into communities of Americans or of any of the people of cool climates.

3. They are already inhabited, as already stated, by about 7,000,000 of people—being more than sixty to the square mile of the whole area of all the islands. The population, therefore, is already denser than that of the State of Michigan. The population is composed of Spaniards, other Europeans, English and Americans, half-castes, Chinese, Malays, Japanese and aboriginal natives. Of the total of all this conglomerate of races the Europeans and Americans compose less

than 2 per cent after more than two hundred years of European occupation, and very few of these were born there. Even in Manila, the capital, 67 per cent of the inhabitants are Malays, 30 per cent are Chinese and half-breeds, Spaniards; Spanish half-breeds and creoles 3 per cent only, and of other white men only a trace and of white women substantially none.

4. The five or six islands of the group of any considerable size are already fully populated by the races and mixtures above mentioned.

5. They are people who never have been and never can be in need of or the consumers of American productions to any appreciable extent.

6. The islands are very fertile and produce principally the fibre known as Manila hemp, coarse tobacco, coffee, sugar and tropical fruits; and they have extensive forests of tropical woods analogous to those of the vast forests of Central and South America.

7. These resources comprise the only value of the islands except that of furnishing a location for fortresses and naval stations for a nation ambitious to become the political and military mistress of the world, A new Alexander or Napoleon, if he possessed inexhaustible resources of men and money, might wish for them for this purpose.

8. The sincerely professed and sole purpose of the war was to make Cuba a free and independent state. Admiral Dewey did not go to Manila for purposes of conquest at all. He went there with his gallant little fleet to capture or destroy, if he could, the Spanish fleet. He did it in a way that astonished the naval powers of the world. But he only acquired military control of the bay and city of Manila and its environments. Nearly all beyond that was in possession of an organized rebellion against Spain.

9. At that time, and long before, an active and powerful rebellion was in progress in the islands, and so far as present information goes it now holds sway over a large part of Luzon and quite or nearly the whole of Panay and of other large districts of these principal islands. It appears to be true that the rebels co-operated with our forces in the overthrow of the Spanish rule at Manila under the impression that our operations at Manila were not to help Spain to put down the rebellion and then take possession for ourselves, but were only to cripple the Spanish power as an incident of war in bringing Spain to renounce its control of Cuba, which Congress had said in its declaration in respect to Cuba was its sole purpose.

10. That the people of the islands who were carrying on the rebellion in order to be free and independent do not desire to be annexed and to become a territorial dependency of the United States of any kind, and that they intend to resist annexation appears to be indisputable.

What I have said so far will not, I take it, be disputed by any intelligent person. What then in the present state of affairs is to be done?

Are we to make war upon the people of the Philippines as Spain was doing, in order to subject them to our dominion?

This apparently we must do to make them a people (whether citizens, subjects or slaves) of the United States.

To justify this "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind" should compel our Government to state definitely the grounds upon which we make the attempt. We have assured the nations of the globe in the most solemn manner possible that we made war not for conquest or extended dominion, but solely to

set the people of Cuba free—of whom Congress declared that “they were and of right ought to be free and independent.”

At that very time the Philippine rebellion was stronger and better organized than that of Cuba. Recent events have proved that the Philippine rebels are as capable of self-government as the people of Cuba. When the United States aided in the attainment and recognized the independence of the Spanish provinces of Central and South America our Government did not set itself up to be the final judges of whether or not they were capable of self-government, although it was perfectly well known that self-government by the people of those provinces could not be such, and never could be such, as the races and inhabitants of temperate zones could establish and maintain.

To force our dominion, then, upon the people of the Philippines would be in opposition to the ever-living principles on which our own nation was founded, and under which it has in a little more than a century grown so great in an ever-increasing native and homogeneous people, established in a temperate zone of the earth, and capable from this cause of continuous development in industry, increase of knowledge, in social order, justice and morality. If we now proceed to conquer (as probably we can, at last, although Spain has failed to do it after more than a century of effort), what shall we say to them is the motive of our conduct?

How are we to explain it to the world, having “a decent respect for the opinions of mankind,” as Jefferson and our fathers thought necessary in our Declaration of Independence?

Can we be justified in forcing by the sword our particular and excellent ideas of government, morality

and religion upon these people, as Mahomet did in his religious wars and as Spain did in her early operations on this continent?

How will such of our "bishops, priests and deacons" and religious newspapers as have appeared to favor the scheme find authority in the greatest and best of all books that have ever been given to mankind—the New Testament—for this new enterprise now proposed for our republic?

All the people of these islands who were the subjects of Spain will become citizens of the United States by the mere act of cession unless the treaty of cession should provide that those who wished could remain subjects of Spain and aliens as to the United States. This has been a necessary rule of international law for hundreds of years; and the rule is founded upon the obvious fact that the people of every country or of any part of it must owe allegiance to and be subject to the government of some sovereign power, be it a tribe, or emperor, or king, or republic, and must, unless they are slaves or serfs, have the rights of such.

But a republic can have no subjects. Its people must be either citizens, slaves or aliens.

If aliens, they are the subjects or citizens of some other power which is bound to protect them. The transfer, therefore, of the sovereignty of Spain over the Philippines to the United States makes all her subjects at once citizens of the United States.

If citizens of the United States, they have all the rights that belong to other citizens in the Territories, whether on the mainland or on islands of the sea. Neither geography nor distance has anything to do with it.

The Constitution of the United States provides for the government of Territories as well as for govern-

ment within the States. In the States the autonomy is fixed in respect of all the three departments of the Government—legislative, executive and judicial. In the Territories Congress is left free to regulate, subject to the Constitution, the means of government according to its discretion. But fundamental and other private rights are, and always have been, as secure under and by force of the same Constitution in the Territories as in the States. The Constitution secures both, only by different methods of exertion. Congress may invest the political government of a Territory in a single person if it chooses, and confide the judicial power to a single judge if it likes, but it cannot authorize the political Governor to make a law that injuriously affects personal rights differently from such laws as Congress may rightfully make for the citizens of a State.

It cannot authorize a Territorial judge to condemn a man unheard or to deal with his person or property otherwise than by that due process of law which the Constitution secures to all the people who owe allegiance to the United States or are within its sovereign power. It cannot say that no citizen residing in a State shall migrate to a Territory, or that a citizen or some particular class of citizens residing in a Territory shall not migrate to a State. In short, the Constitution does operate and have full force in our Territories in the respects that affect the personal and civil rights of all.

This fundamental principle (self-evident on our republican theory of government) has been constantly recognized and acted upon by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Congress, therefore, cannot lawfully prevent the migration of any citizen residing in the Philippines

(and every Spanish subject therein becomes one by force of the treaty) to our States any more than it can lawfully prevent the migration of citizens of the States to the Philippines. It is not well, then, to shut our eyes to dangers of this character that attend such acquisition of territories fully populated by such peoples as those of the Philippines are known to be.

There are other considerations, both humane and financial, that cannot be ignored. If the people of the Philippines, both civilized and savage, must be subdued to our Christian government by force of arms, how many American lives and how much American treasure ought to be sacrificed to that end?

Rapidly developing events seem to show that a military force of at least 50,000 men must be kept up on land in those islands in order to our obtaining an effectual supremacy.

And this force must be supported by many naval vessels, with their crews, etc. To keep up such an establishment it is evident from the experience of Spain and from that of other nations carrying on such operations in the tropics that a constant current of supply and reinforcement both of material and men must go on.

Besides the casualties of battle with foes (some of whom Spain has not been able to subdue in 200 years of effort) there is also the constant and unconquerable foe of the tropical climate and the diseases always present in it.

And besides this no troops from the temperate zones can long endure the effect of such a climate, and they must therefore be withdrawn to some cooler latitude at very short periods to recuperate. The English in India happily have the Himalayan hills within comparatively short distances, to which their troops are

sent at frequent intervals to escape the exhaustion of the tropical seacoast. But our troops in the Philippines must be transported by sea four or five thousand miles to reach the salubrious shores of California and Oregon. To accomplish all this the annual and continuous expenditure of millions upon millions of the earnings of our people must go on indefinitely.

But we are now confronted with both a "condition" and a "theory." The Executive has concluded a treaty by which Spain has ceded the sovereignty of the whole Philippine group, of which she had actual possession of only a small fraction, and in many parts of which her dominion had been absolutely overthrown, and in other parts of which she never had any dominion at all, many of the islands having from the first until to-day been inhabited by independent tribes over which Spain never had any actual dominion.

In dealing with this treaty the Senate is supposed to be as free to act according to its own judgment as the President was free to act according to his in negotiating it. The Senate may decline to ratify the treaty, which in the present state of affairs would produce a situation extremely embarrassing. But if the Senate believes the treaty to be wrong it will doubtless have the courage to reject it and to face the consequences.

The Senate, however, may consider that while Spain ought to depart from the Philippines and renounce her dominion there, the United States ought not to assume her sovereignty, such as it was, against the express will of the people of the islands. And in view of the evils likely to follow even if those people desired to become a part of the United States, the Senate can amend the treaty so as to provide substantially, as the scheme has been as to Cuba, that the people of those islands should be left to govern them-

selves as best they may, with such guarantees for order and personal safety of the inhabitants as shall be adequate to the preservation of order. Such a guarantee can be presently enforced at infinitely less cost of blood and treasure than our undertaking to assume and exercise sovereignty over the islands.

In such a case every material benefit of trade, commerce and of political expediency can be attained.

I make no comment in respect of the price of \$20,000,000 provided by the treaty to be paid to Spain for the islands. In view of the gravity of the other aspects of the subject it is not worthy of notice.

CHAPTER XXIII.

A GOVERNMENT BASED ON FORCE.

BY HON. MARION BUTLER,

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM NORTH CAROLINA.

The daily reports from the scene of war in the Philippine Islands cannot have failed to cause considerable reflection on the part of even a casual observer of current events. One day the Associated Press reports announce, in great headlines, that "Our Troops Are Steadily Advancing Against the Filipinos;" another day that, "General Otis has the Situation well under Control;" another day that, "General Otis thinks there is no Doubt about his Subjugating the Filipinos after Awhile;" another day that, "There was on Yesterday a Sharp Engagement between our Troops and the Filipinos, we lost Fifty Men, the Fillipinos lost Heavily, but Number Unknown;" another day that, "General Otis is Preparing to Make a more Vigorous Onslaught against the Stubborn Fillipinos." Only a few days ago the announcement was that there had been a very sharp engagement, and that our soldiers fought bravely and sustained the deadly fire of the Filipinos with great courage; that while we lost a hundred or more, the Fillipinos lost much more heavily, etc., etc. This same dispatch contained a list of the killed and wounded of our men, which made over a column in fine type.

No one has ever doubted the ability of the United States Government to subjugate the Fillipinos; and,

in fact, to kill and bury every one of them if we so desired. If we should conquer such an half-fed, half-clothed, and half-savage people in an hundred different islands, there would be no glory or credit in it for a great civilized government like the United States. The question for the American people to consider is whether or not it is right and best for us to do this thing. First, whether it is right and consistent with the principles upon which this government is founded; and, second, without even regarding the questions of right and morals, whether or not the game is worth the ammunition.

If we had the Philippine Islands, what would we do with them? If we attempt to govern them as a conquered people (a thing that must be repugnant to every American patriot and to every believer in a free government) it will be necessary for us to always keep a large standing army at great expense, ready to shoot down and kill the inhabitants of those islands whenever they evince the least desire for freedom, just as the English were ready to shoot us down in 1776, or to hang any of our leading patriots up by the neck whenever, by tongue or pen, they dared to express the sentiment that we ought to have a free government of our own. It is no answer for us to say that we were better qualified for self-government in 1776 than the Filipinos are now or will ever be. If the Declaration of Independence is true, then the Fillipinos are just as much entitled to a free government as we were, and are entitled to the kind of government which is best suited to them, which government will be the kind that they are capable of forming and maintaining. A people become more capable of self-government as they have the burdens and responsibilities of government thrust upon them.

Besides, we will have to send a large number of office-holders to those islands who would not only draw their salaries from our government, but who would consider it their privilege to plunder and oppress the Fillipinos for their own personal profit and gain. What advantage could come to our people or to our government from this great outlay of money, this corruption in high places, and this course which would result in necessary murder to enforce our decrees? None whatever. There might be a few monopolists in this country who could gobble up some franchises or valuable resources of the islands for their own personal profit, while Uncle Sam and the American people footed the bills and committed the greater crimes necessary for their personal gain. We paid Spain twenty million dollars for a law suit. We have already spent much more than that amount since in trying to establish our claim, which will be worse than a white elephant after we have won it. This is the financial side of the transaction, but the effect that such a course will have upon our own government at home is still more serious and important.

No individual can ever elevate himself and accomplish anything praiseworthy and noble without having a high ideal for his rule of conduct, towards which he is always striving whether he reaches it or not. The same is true of a nation, and vitally true of a Republic. Our forefathers set up in the Declaration of Independence the highest Code of political morals ever promulgated by man. Firmly planted on these great principles as the bed-rock of our faith, this government has grown rich and powerful in the brief time of a century, becoming to be not only a world power but the greatest world power known. While it is true that our government has not always lived up to the

principles of the Declaration of Independence, any more than has the most devout Christian lived up in strict letter to the Ten Commandments, yet the important thing is that the Nation has always held to these principles and striven toward them just as the Christian has always kept before him the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule as his cloud by day and his pillar of fire by night. Nations and individuals make mistakes, take false steps; but these are never serious as long as we stand by our ideals and principles, because the mistakes will simply serve as examples and object-lessons to point out dangers and warn us against making other such false steps in the future. But whenever a nation or an individual deliberately disregards its high ideals, and deliberately turns its back upon them all in order to commit a false step, then such a false step is fatal and the individual and the nation taking it is lost.

So the policy upon which the Syndicates and the Monopolists and Franchise-Grabbers have forced this country to embark, in open repudiation of every principle of the Declaration of Independence and of every fundamental principle underlying a free Republic, is fatal to the government unless the people themselves realize the enormity of the crime committed, drive from power their false representatives, and restore the government into the hands of the followers of Jefferson and Lincoln.

CHAPTER XXIV.

A REPUBLIC CAN HAVE NO SUBJECTS.

BY HON. ADLAI E. STEVENSON,

EX-VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

During the century now drawing to a close America has given to the world its best lessons in liberty and in law. Near its beginning to Great Britain—no less than to Spain at its close—it has given a never-to-be-forgotten lesson in the dread art of war. The brilliancy of recent victories, the splendid achievements of our arms upon foreign shores and upon distant waters, can not obscure or dim the glory of the triumph of American valor at New Orleans upon the proud day of which this is the anniversary. The 8th of January is one of the sacred days of our calendar.

Each recurring anniversary recalls a bloody struggle which will for all time hold its place in history. Upon that day Jackson, with a handful of militia, with a loss of seven killed and six wounded, defeated and captured the splendidly equipped regulars of the British army. The disgraceful surrender of Hull at Detroit, the wanton destruction by fire of the public buildings at Washington, with all the insults and wrongs which had precipitated the second war with Great Britain, were more than atoned for by the victory we celebrate. It was the last battle of the war; the last fought—the last, I trust in God, that will ever be fought—by England against the United States. The events which inspired, together with the glorious culmination of a struggle forced by a powerful upon a weak nation,

belong now to the domain of history. No American will forget that the British courage, before which a few months later the old guard of Napoleon went down at Waterloo, was unable to cope with Jackson and his heroic comrades at New Orleans.

The treaty of Ghent, establishing peace—which I trust will endure with the ages—between Great Britain and America, had been signed on the 24th of December, fourteen days before the great battle was fought. For many days thereafter, its existence was unknown to the real actors in the great drama. We stand in awe as we contemplate the marvels which have been wrought out by man in the years that lie between that great event and the present hour.

We celebrate each returning 8th of January—as each returning Fourth day of July—in no spirit of unfriendliness to the land from which we derive our language and in a measure our laws, but that the noble deeds of the illustrious dead, the founders and defenders of the Republic, may not perish from the memories of the living. Responding and rejoicing as we do at every manifestation of good will upon the part of the mother country toward her once dependent colonies, yet it is not meet that the truths of history be forgotten. Earnestly as we desire that for the future “the battle flag be furled” between us and our kindred beyond the sea, yet may the day be far distant when the recurrence of our national anniversaries fail to touch a responsive chord in the American heart.

Upon this historic anniversary and this coming together of such as are of the political faith of Andrew Jackson, it may not be out of place to note in brief words some of the achievements of the great party of which during a stormy career he was the acknowledged chieftain and defender. The Democratic party, under the leadership of its immortal founder, Thomas

Jefferson, after a memorable contest, came into power on the 4th day of March, 1801. The intervening years that stretch back to that masterful hour make up almost a century of our national life. No age nor country within so brief a span has witnessed events so stupendous, achievements so marvelous along all pathways of human thought and endeavor. All that genius in the ages past has contributed to the world's treasury of knowledge—to whatever tends to human comfort and to the lessening of human distress—dwindles in the presence of the marvelous achievements of the nineteenth century.

The United States of America—its form of government still an experiment—containing a few millions of people, with but scant population west of the Alleghenies, its frontiers in constant menace from the savage, without army or navy, was struggling for place among the nations. The hour that witnessed the inauguration of Jefferson witnessed the first advent to power of the great political party which for more than one-half the years that make up our constitutional history has controlled the destiny of the Republic. In his brief address to his countrymen upon his induction into the great office Jefferson gave expression to his views upon the salient principles of government, and formulated that confession of political faith which for almost a century has been the touchstone of all Democratic platforms and creeds.

As the key to constitutional interpretation, as the corner stone of our governmental fabric, he proclaimed: "Equal and exact justice to all men of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights as the most convenient administration for all our domestic concerns; the

preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics; a well-disciplined militia, our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture and of commerce as its handmaid, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus, and trial by juries impartially selected."

During fifty-six of the ninety-eight years that have passed since this "creed of our political faith" was declared, the Democratic party has been in control of the General Government. With the deathless principles here enunciated as its evangel, it has kept the faith. In victory and in defeat it has held inviolable the tenets of its great apostle. It celebrated its advent to power by the repeal of the odious alien and sedition laws; enacted by the Federal party during the Administration of Adams. The champion of "equal and exact justice to all men," it stands to-day, as in the past, the relentless foe of special privileges, of organized greed, of high protective and prohibitory tariffs, of all unlawful combinations, monopolies and "trusts"—of whatever tends to oppress or to enrich a class at the expense of the people. Deprecating whatever deprives the accused of his guaranteed right of trial by jury, it held with our great court—amid the storm and stress of civil strife—"the Constitution of the United States the supreme law of the land, in war as well as in peace." Recognizing the wisdom of the fathers in the creation of the great co-ordinate departments of the

Government, the Democratic party, at a critical moment in our history, defeated the mad efforts of the dominant party in Congress to remove from his high office by impeachment the President of the United States for the exercise of clearly defined executive duties.

The antagonist at all times of religious tests and religious intolerance, the Democratic party—amid the excitement and passion born of Know-Nothing fanaticism and proscription—stood, the bulwark of liberty and conscience—of the right to worship God according to the dictates of individual judgment and reason. To the end that “labor be lightly burdened” and commerce, “the handmaid of agriculture,” encouraged, the Democratic party stands now, as in the past, for “tariff for revenue only,” for the reduction to the minimum of the cost of all necessary articles of consumption. Experience has demonstrated that high tariffs have deprived the Government of its needed revenues, secured to the favored beneficiaries colossal fortunes, and largely increased to the people the cost of the necessaries of life. The baleful but logical results of so-called “protection” are seen in the sudden growth of giant monopolies, combination in restraint of lawful trade, and “trusts,” more perilous than foreign foe to the existence of popular government.

“Economy in the public expense” has been and will continue the party shibboleth of democracy. “Subsidies” and all unnecessary expenditures of the public money have ever found untiring foes in those who hold the political faith of Jefferson. Recognizing the imperative obligation to maintain intact State as well as Federal authority—each within the limits prescribed by the Constitution—the Democratic party, with Jefferson, would maintain the rights of the States “as most convenient for the administration of all domestic con-

cerns," and recognize as paramount the sacred obligation "to preserve the General Government in its constitutional vigor as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and our safety abroad." "Honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith." It was during the wise and economical administration of President Jackson that the last dollar of governmental indebtedness was paid and our national debt wholly extinguished.

The Democratic party would mete out even-handed justice alike to creditor and debtor. It is the antagonist of whatever, either in legislation or administration, would impair the sacredness of existing obligations or render their discharge more difficult by augmenting or by lessening the debt-paying power of money. "A well-disciplined militia—our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war." True at the beginning of the century, with a few millions of population, no less true at the close, as we stand in the fore-front of the nations, with a population of 70,000,000. The result of our recent conflict with Spain gives emphasis to the prophetic words of Jefferson. Existing conditions in continental Europe, entailing taxation and misery to the verge of human endurance, illustrate by sad object lessons the inevitable results of large standing armies in time of peace.

Shall we still give heed to the warning of the great sage of the revolution or enter upon a new century with European monarchies as our model? Shall we be deaf to the teachings of one hundred years of our own history? Without a large standing army, but relying upon the patriotism and courage of American manhood, we were victorious in the war with Great Britain, with Mexico, in the great civil strife, and with Spain. In the light of history, can it be possible that the American people will consent to the creation of a

large standing army and its consequent continuing and ever-increasing burden of taxation? Shall this be the response of the free Republic to the appeal that comes from despotic Russia for the disarmament of all the nations?

“Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none.” At no period in our history have these words of Jefferson possessed a deeper significance. Before we abandon the traditions of the fathers it is well that we deliberate upon the possible consequences of a departure from the settled governmental policy of more than a century. Not in the “delirium of victory,” but only after calm discussion of what may follow, should the momentous question now presented be determined. Nations as well as individuals may “do that in their zeal which their calmer judgment dare not approve.” It would be difficult to conceive of a question more vital, more far reaching in its consequences, than that now confronting us as to the disposition of recent conquered territory.

Is it too much to say that the enforcement of the proposed policy of the expansionists in a large measure involves the question of a change in our form of government? It can hardly be contended that the measure proposed for the control or government of the Philippine Islands finds warrant in the Constitution. Shall the closing hours of the century witness the American people abandoning the pathway in which past generations have found prosperity and happiness, and embarking upon that of aggression and expansion, against which we are warned by the wrecks which lie along the entire pathway of history? Even if true that “imperialism” would open up a new and larger field for our commerce and make us an important factor in the great affairs of nations, even

these would be purchased at too dear a price. Standing out against the new policy of expansion, of absorbing distant islands, with their 10,000,000 mongrel population, into our body politic, with all it involves of European complication, are the warnings of the founders of the Republic. It was Jefferson who said: "Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe."

Washington, when retiring from his great office, left these farewell words to be read and pondered by the oncoming generations of his countrymen: "The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible. Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand on foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle ourselves in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, or caprice?"

To those who, in the exuberance of feeling produced by suddenly discovered kinship, would "interweave our destiny" with that of England, counting on her friendship and aid in whatever continental entanglements may result from imperialism, it may be well to recall the suggestive words of Washington: "There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard." Is it asking too much of the American people to solemnly ponder the warn-

ings of Washington and his compatriots before venturing upon an untried pathway beset with foreign jealousies, complications, and antagonisms?

As precedents for the proposed policy of expansion we are referred by its advocates to the Louisiana purchase and to the vast area added to our Republic by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Neither the purchase from France in 1803 nor the cession by Mexico half a century ago furnish a precedent for the policy now proposed to be inaugurated. By the Louisiana purchase the United States acquired the vast territory stretching northward to the British possessions and westward from the Mississippi to the domain of the Spaniard. Out of this vast area, purchased for \$15,000,000 from the great Napoleon, have been carved fourteen sovereign States. As the result of the masterly statesmanship of President Jefferson and the unrivaled diplomacy of Monroe and Livingston the free navigation of the Mississippi was secured forever, and a magnificent area, an empire in extent, made a part of our national domain. This grand achievement is the glory of Jefferson and of the great historic party of which he was the founder.

Under a later Democratic administration, and as the result of the treaty which terminated our war with Mexico, we acquired California, Nevada, Utah, a portion of Arizona, and New Mexico, thus bringing under our flag, to remain forever, the vast expanse stretching from the eastern seaboard to the Pacific Ocean. The territory thus acquired was the fit abode for men of our own race. Either at the period of annexation or soon thereafter it passed under the rule of the Anglo-Saxon, who had carried with him our language and our laws. It was territory contiguous to our own, and acquired with the intention at the proper time—when population and conditions would justify—of

carving it into States. The wisdom that inspired all this seems more than human. The result: Millions of happy American homes, increase beyond the dreams of avarice of our national wealth, and the United States chief among the nations of the earth.

Are we to be told that history is but repeating itself, and that the contemplated annexation or absorption of the Philippine Archipelago finds precedent in the historic events I have mentioned? The answer is found in the bare statement of facts. The acquired territory is contiguous; the Philippine islands, 8,000 miles distant. The former adapted to the residence, comfort, and happiness of our own people; the latter the fit abode for the half-civilized and degraded races, its only occupants amid poverty and wretchedness for centuries. The acquisition of the territory upon our own continent added little to the national expense; to maintain sovereignty over the distant islands will necessitate immense expenditures upon our Army and Navy. The people of the former were of the self-governing races; the latter know no rule but that of force.

We are told that "Trade follows the flag," and that untold commercial advantages will result from the proposed acquisition. Trade knows no sentiment; it goes where it is profitable. What of our products will find market in these remote islands? Ninety per cent of our exports reach European markets "because only the civilized man is the consumer." Whatever of commercial advantage may result from annexation will be as the dust in the balance to the immense naval expenditure it entails.

The graver questions involved in the proposed scheme of annexation are yet to be considered. What is to be the permanent form of government for the Philippine Islands? I do not controvert the power of

the National Government to acquire new territory. The power incident, of establishing for it temporary government, is alike unquestioned. The instances already cited, of the Louisiana purchase and that by treaty from Mexico, are well established precedents. In these cases, however, it was never questioned that, with suitable boundaries and division and under proper regulations, the entire territory would ultimately attain to statehood.

The question recurs, What form of government do the expansionists propose for the Philippine Islands? Are the Territorial or colonial governments which Congress may possibly establish to be only preliminary to the creation of sovereign States to be admitted into the Federal Union? This of necessity contemplates the admission of many additional Senators and Representatives to seats in Congress, the aggregate population of the islands now being double that of our entire country at the first inauguration of Washington. In view of the degraded character of the population, their total unfitness for self-government, the proposition is monstrous. Its consummation would be a crime against civilization.

If it be the intention to establish our political institutions in these remote islands, then what becomes of the "Monroe doctrine"? This vital international policy, announced by the President of the United States seventy-five years ago, was: "We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." Immediately following this, and as part of the declared intention of our Government, so clearly enunciated by Monroe, was the solemn declaration: "With the existing colonies

or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere."

The Monroe doctrine is wholesome and enduring. It is the faith of Americans of every creed and party—is of the very warp and woof of our political being. It was promulgated at the critical moment when the "Holy Alliance" was attempting to stifle the republican spirit and re-establish the despotism of Spain upon her revolted colonies in South America and Mexico. The essence of the doctrine, as understood by the world then, was, while we forbid the establishment of despotic governments upon the American continent, we recognize the corresponding obligation to refrain from any attempt to force our political system upon any part of the Old World. This has been our settled rule of faith and practice for seventy-five years. Its promulgation defeated the purpose of the Holy Alliance and destroyed forever the power of Spain upon this continent. Under it Louis Napoleon, a third of a century ago, was obliged to withdraw the French army from Mexico and leave the ill-starred Maximilian to his fate. Under it the empire established by foreign bayonets disappeared and the Republic was restored. Are we now to say that we still recognize the binding force of this doctrine upon other nations, but not upon ourselves?

If ultimate statehood for these remote islands be disclaimed, how, then, are they to be held and governed? The only alternative is by force—by the power of the Army and the Navy; and this not for a day or for a year, but for time. What then becomes of the bed-rock principle that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed?" If they are to be held permanently, as conquered provinces, then it will not only be in absolute disregard of all the traditions of the past, but in direct antagonism to

the letter and spirit of our Declaration of Independence. It is no less true now than in the days of our Revolution that "government by arbitrary power is still despotism."

A question yet more grave can not escape our serious consideration. It is one that touches the good faith, the honor of our nation. Events have crowded in such rapid succession that we seem to have forgotten the avowed purpose of the war with Spain. It was declared to be a war solely in the interests of humanity—solely for the relief of the oppressed and starving at our door. An eminent Republican Senator a few months ago voiced the sentiments of the entire country when he said: "It is a war in which there does not enter the slightest thought or desire of foreign conquest or of national gain or advantage." Alas, what a change has come in so brief a time! The wrongs of the poor Cuban are forgotten, and the dream of the imperialist is now of untold commercial gain and of the United States becoming chief among the factors in European politics. "We can not escape history." For all time we will be judged by our solemn disclaimer, immediately following the formal declaration of war:

"The United States hereby disclaims any disposition to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people."

It was this solemn disclaimer by the American Congress that justified the war at the bar of our own conscience and that of the world. To say now that our disclaimer applied only to Cuba and not to other Spanish dependencies would be only "to palter with words in a double sense." It is a subterfuge un-

worthy of the greatest of nations. Is it too late even now to demand of those whose hands hold power to make good our solemn declaration that our war with Spain was waged not in the spirit of aggrandizement but solely in the interest of humanity?

CHAPTER XXV.

NECESSARY AND NATURAL TERRITORIAL EXPANSION.

BY HON. WILLIAM V. ALLEN,
UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM NEBRASKA.

No attempt will be made by me to discuss the question of national expansion at any length. I will confine myself to referring to that subject in general language, but before I conclude I shall attempt to distinguish between necessary and natural territorial expansion and what may be called Napoleonic imperialism.

I shall vote to ratify the treaty of peace with Spain, and in doing so I must not be regarded as representing the views of anyone but those of my constituents and myself. I have necessarily been absent from the Chamber for some days and I have not had the full benefit of all the speeches that have been made during that time, but I have read sufficiently on the subject to satisfy my mind as to what course I should pursue. I think, however, that I ought now to set at rest, as far as I am capable of doing so, a suggestion of the Sunday morning Washington Times, in which it is said:

If Senator Allen makes good his promise to enlighten the Senate and the country as to the motives that control Senator Gorman in committing his party in the Senate to a cause directly opposite to that recommended by William J. Bryan, * * * and if all other things happen that it was said yesterday would happen, then the three hours of the Senate's session preceding the vote on the peace treaty will indeed be dramatic and exciting.

If there is anything I dislike, it is to be patted on the back and coddled and nursed like an infant by a

newspaper. I have the greatest respect for that kind of journalism that is cast on a high plane and takes a lofty view of public questions, but I have not the slightest regard for that kind that would deal with the prejudices of men or that would appeal to any real or supposed vanity that I might possess to influence my conduct regarding a public question. The statement of that paper is gratuitous. It is wholly inexcusable, for I have at no time "promised to enlighten the Senate and the country as to the motives that control the action of Senator Gorman." Nor do I know what his motives are or what he intends doing, nor am I concerned in knowing.

I am not the keeper of the conscience or of the opinions of Colonel Bryan. I know no more of his wishes or opinions than I gather from his public utterances, a means of information open to all. I do not presume to represent him here or elsewhere and assertions frequently made that I am doing so are utterly unfounded, sinister, and insincere. I am proud to admit that I at least regard myself as the personal, as I trust I am also his political, friend, and I may be permitted to say, in this presence, without intending to reflect in the slightest degree on any other gentleman in public life, that I regard him as easily the superior in point of knowledge and capacity for public duty of any living American statesman, and I do this not because I am his debtor for political or other favors, as he is not my debtor. Whatever may betide him, I am clearly of the opinion that the impartial historian who may write in the calm of another age will rank him with Webster and Clay and that he will be regarded by future generations as one of the greatest statesmen our country has produced. I look upon him as a comet that has appeared in the political heavens, as those great statesmen appeared, that is

seen upon the political horizon of our country once in a generation only.

If there is a man in this world who is absolutely sincere in the doctrines he advocates, that man is Mr. Bryan. He is not a demagogue, as the groundlings and tumblebugs of politics would have the world believe. The sincerity of his political convictions no man who knows him can question. They partake more of religion to him than anything else. To him his duty and pathway are clear. He is not seeking personal advantage, and his convictions on public questions are dearer than the office of President of the United States.

In another article in the Washington Sunday Times it is said:

The same gossips who have associated Senator Quay's name with a possible bolt on the treaty are also referring to Senator Allen, of Nebraska, as one desiring some favors of the Administration. It seems to be a fairly well-established fact that in the early part of the debate on the treaty Senator Allen announced himself in favor of its ratification, and before going to Nebraska, about three weeks ago, he was paired with a Senator who would vote in opposition. After Senator Allen returned from Nebraska he was quick to announce that he was going to vote against the treaty, and shortly after the Senate convened yesterday he offered a resolution more sweeping in its provisions than any of those now pending introduced by Senator Vest, Senator Bacon, and Senator Sullivan. Mr. Allen goes further than the others. He is not willing to accept Porto Rico as one of the spoils of war, but wants to give the people of that island, as well as the Filipinos, an independent government, the same as is promised for Cuba.

It has been intimated that Senator Allen would not object if the Administration would so exercise its influence on the Nebraska legislature as to have the Republicans join with the Populists and re-elect him for another term. It is not known that Senator Allen would change his position on the treaty if this were done, but it is argued in political circles that this might not be bad politics from an Administration point of view.

It is very difficult to meet and refute a gratuitous and unwarranted assertion of this kind. No man has ever had the slightest occasion to doubt where I stood in respect to the ratification of the treaty. I have never occupied doubtful ground. From the time the treaty came to this Chamber and was laid before us, aye, at a time when I knew through the press what its provisions were, important as they are and as di-

vergent as they are from my own views, I announced my purpose to vote for its ratification.

I am not seeking favors at the hands of this Administration. There is no favor President McKinley could confer upon me that would change my opinion in the slightest degree. I am an American citizen, having all the convictions and intensity of purpose of an American citizen. I am not prepared to surrender my views for favors to be shown. I would rather take my station among the humblest of my kind than to surrender an honest conviction, that is always dear to a self-respecting man.

I have not seen nor talked with the correspondent of a newspaper since my return to this city from my home in Nebraska, and no man has a right to attribute, and if he was a self-respecting man he would not attribute, to me opinions and purposes and motives I have not entertained.

X Because I shall vote for the treaty it does not follow that I am in favor of annexation. I do it for the simple reason that in my judgment the Government of the United States can not afford to open up negotiations with the Spanish dynasty again. We have the whole question within our jurisdiction and within our power, and here and by us alone it should be settled. If by amending the treaty we send it back for further consideration by the commissioners, or to new commissioners to be appointed; if we open up the subject-matter of the treaty, we will, in my judgment, especially in the light of very recent events, incur the danger of European interference and European complications.

It is because we will have the power, when the treaty is ratified, of determining the form of government to be set up in the Philippine Islands and in the other possessions that have come to us as a result

of the war, without incurring any danger from abroad, that I shall vote for the ratification of the treaty.

If I had been a member of the commission I would not have assented to many of its provisions. I would have insisted that the same provision which applies to Cuba should apply to the Philippines and to Porto Rico. Otherwise I would not have been brought to sign the treaty or the report favorably recommending it. The treaty is here, and it must be disposed of by the American Senate without further delay.

I am not in favor and I shall not vote for the joint resolution of the senior Senator from Georgia. If passed by Congress and signed by the President, it would simply become a statute that may be repealed by another Congress. It is not expressive of the conviction of this body, which is the constitutional tribunal that must pass upon the treaty and construe and give it force. It would not, in my judgment, possess the force of an ordinary Senate resolution expressing the views of the Senate.

There have been in the entire history of our Government, from the formation of the Constitution and the distribution of its respective powers, two schools of constitutional thought; the one holding tenaciously to the doctrine that the Government possesses and can exercise authority, so far as its foreign policy is concerned, consistent only with the primary purpose of maintaining a government for certain well-defined territories and well-defined inhabitants thereof and their posterity. This school is known as strict constructionists. They hold that the government is one of delegated powers alone, and that a power does not exist unless expressly granted or necessarily, or at least conveniently, implied to carry out a granted power.

The other school is perhaps best known as the Ham-



W. H. Harvey.



A. J. Warner.

iltonian theorists, that have from time to time held that the Constitution created a government national in character and possessing, as respects its external relations, not only an express but an implied authority necessary to be exercised with foreign countries as completely and as fully as any nation of the world. Arguments have been brought forth from time to time by these different schools in advocacy of their respective views, and conflicts of a very sharp and important nature have been the result.

Every constitutional expression, clause, and sentence has been examined with a resolute purpose of ascertaining its true meaning, not only in the light of original discussion and as presenting a question of first instance and greatest importance, but also in the light of history and of the spirit and atmosphere of the period of constitutional formation. The temper, habits, and thought, as well as the known intention, of the framers and their unswerving desire of erecting a government that should exist for all time, under whose flag and sovereignty the mightiest nation of the earth would be carried forward to a dreamless and endless destiny, have been considered.

I have been impressed, since the acquisition of this new territory as a result of the war with Spain, with the overshadowing necessity of considering the question with faultless accuracy. What we may do is not to be the work of an hour, nor can it be undone by subsequent legislation or executive order, but it is to stand for all time and involves for final weal or woe the present inhabitants of the United States and those of the new territory, as well as those of countless generations to succeed. If, unfortunately, we shall authoritatively express a conclusion that would cause our country to be overrun by a horde of alien peoples in no manner capable of using or enjoying the bless-

ings and privileges of self-government, or of maintaining them when won by others, whose presence and influence would deteriorate or injure the nation, ultimately wrecking the Constitution and destroying our political institutions, a horde of people unassimilable by reason of turbid and passionate natures, the consequences would be fearful to the happiness and progress of the world, and we would be justly chargeable with inexcusable incompetency to deal with the question.

The Government of the United States was erected for all ages. It was established through the agitation, struggle, and bloodshed of those who had been seeking for generations the formation of political institutions where individual independence, action, and thought would have the largest field of operation. The doctrine of the divine right of kings to rule was for the first time in the history of the world ignored and set aside, after a revolution lasting over seven years and prosecuted under discouraging circumstances, but, which, aided by Divine Providence, eventually resulted in the dismemberment of that people from the mother country and from her political institutions. For the first time in all history the right of every human being, by virtue of his birth, to govern himself and indirectly exercise sovereignty in the conduct of the affairs of his Government, helping to shape its policies and to mold its institutions, was announced.

Europe, horrified at this declaration, expressed free and frequent opinions that a government by the people could not long exist, and that, amid warring factions, turbulent multitudes, and the incompetency of those intrusted with the immediate exercise of sovereignty, it would fall and be succeeded by an aristocracy, an oligarchy, or even monarchy itself. It has been the pride of every American citizen that the political

institutions erected by the fathers of the Republic for the benefit of themselves and their posterity have survived, and that by the exercise of a high degree of intelligence and deliberation, caution, patriotism, and moderation, it will be within the power of the people to reorganize the authority of the Republic on higher and broader principles and place it in a position where the least restraint shall be exercised over the people consistent with public peace, good order, and safety.

We should not, in discussing the questions presented by these resolutions, forget these facts, and nothing should be done that would in the slightest degree militate against or imperil our institutions.

But the first question presented for consideration is one of naked constitutional power of acquiring territory and the extension thereover of the provisions of the Constitution to the inhabitants at the moment of its acquisition. I must admit, although familiar in a general way with the history of the formation and great purpose of the Constitution, that when I first began examining this question and the policy and course of the Government I found myself, as I supposed, unalterably arrayed against it.

I had held, as I think all will agree, that this being a government of enumerated powers, written and implied, the doctrine of limitation extends to our foreign relations as well as to our domestic institutions, and that a power not classified with one or the other of these does not exist, and I am inclined to think that this was the earlier opinion of those who participated directly in laying the foundation of the Republic. But I am now convinced that I was wrong in so far as the exercise of constitutional power with foreign nations, or in the acquisition of additional territory is concerned. Whether or not the great lawyers, patriots, and statesmen who drafted and adopted the Declara-

tion of Independence, and those who submitted the Constitution of the United States, as well as many of its amendments to the people, clearly understood the power that was being granted to the nation, so far as its foreign relations are concerned, it must, I think, be admitted that express grants were made that gave the United States as full and perfect sovereignty in our relations with foreign countries and foreign people as would or could be possessed or exercised by the most absolute kingdom or monarchy of earth.

Doubtless it was not believed by many in the early history of the Government and during the period covered by the promulgation of the Declaration of Independence, the formation of the Articles of Confederation, and the Constitution, that we would ever extend our jurisdiction over the entire Temperate Zone of America, and few dreamed that a powerful and compact nation with limitless commerce and agriculture and with complex industries would eventually extend from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean.

There may have been those who hoped for that time, and therefore it is consonant with the truth to say that it may have been anticipated, if such an event should happen, that Congress should have power to admit new States "into this Union," and "dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and all other property belonging to the United States."

It seems to me that it cannot, in the light of the amendments to the Constitution, be denied that the United States possesses this power. There was a time in the history of this Government when the status of an American citizen was uncertain; there was a time when the question was mooted whether there could be a citizen of the United States separate and distinct from his citizenship of a State. I say the question

was at least unsettled. There were jurists of national reputation, high in authority, who held that every man acquired his citizenship of the United States by and through the fact that he was a citizen of some State, while on the other hand, there were those equally high in authority, and whose opinions were of equal weight, who held that the Constitution, regardless of the amendments, created the distinct character of a citizen of the United States independently of the State or Territory in which the individual resided.

In the light of amendments to the Constitution, I think there can be no longer any question respecting the status of a citizen; but I desire to refer to and read section 3, Article IV, of the Constitution, which says:

New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

The words of that section are general. "New States," so it says, "may be admitted by the Congress into this Union;" and then the section immediately limits the general language employed, providing "but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress."

From what territory was it anticipated that new States should be formed? The colonies had certain possessions at the time of the formation of the Constitution. If new States could not be erected out of the States already in existence or by the consolidation of States or parts of States without their consent, and without the consent of Congress, where was the Government to look for the territory it could admit as new States into the Union? I cannot and do not

believe it was in the minds of the great men who framed this great charter of our liberty that the territorial dominion and jurisdiction of this Government should be limited to the thirteen States east of the Allegheny Mountains. I believe that Washington and his compatriots looked west of the Alleghenies and across this continent to the Pacific Ocean, and that the great men who penned this immortal instrument had it in their minds that this Government would grow to a point where it would be necessary and proper to annex new territory and to admit new States.

I turn briefly to paragraph 2 of same section of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

What territory was meant by this provision of the Constitution? Was it intended that Congress should have power to make rules and regulations for governing the territory embraced in the States? Certainly not. Each of the States had a perfect government of its own, exercising every conceivable power an independent government could exercise, except in those cases where the States granted power to the General Government, and where by the adoption of the Constitution they had restrained themselves from the exercise of power; in other words, when the Government of the United States was created, the thirteen original States carved out of their otherwise unrestricted sovereignty certain powers which they conferred on the General Government, and restrained themselves from the exercise of certain other powers, and with those exceptions each State to-day can exercise all the power of the most independent and absolute government of earth.

I must necessarily be brief in the remarks I am to make; but I cannot resist the temptation of calling attention to a remarkable statement of the senior Senator from Ohio in his speech the other day, when he declared that the Declaration of Independence was simply a bill of complaint, or a bill enumerating certain grievances against the British Crown.

I am not too old to learn; I learn daily; and I hope during the years that may be allotted to me on earth I may never grow so old and inattentive to duty as not to learn hour by hour: and yet I have supposed throughout all the years of my life that the Declaration of Independence is the first great charter of American liberty. It was not the beginning of government; it was the first crystallization in the form of a written document of certain well-known and generally accepted doctrines held in this country in colonial days; it was the first defiance that was hurled in the face of England and continental Europe by the colonists who inhabited this country. It was not and is not simply a bill of complaint against the English Government. Let me read a paragraph from it. Said the Continental Congress:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

That does not sound like a mere bill of complaint against the English Government. It was the announcement of principles that are as deathless as the sun and as eternal as the rock-ribbed earth. I say in this splendid presence this day that I hold to the doctrine that every human being is born with the

right to rule and control himself, if capable. I cannot understand how, through the ages that have passed, any man could be found of such indifferent or weak intellect that he could have reached a different belief.

It is as much the right of a Filipino to govern himself, if he is capable of doing so, as it is the right of an American citizen to do so. This doctrine is not confined to the people of the United States. It extends, according to the language, to all men, wherever found; yet the Senator from Ohio would have this great document mean no more than a mere bill of complaint against the English Crown!

Nor can I agree with the Senator from Connecticut, who announced the startling doctrine in this Chamber that it was the right of "some of the governed" to participate in the government. That, too, is a novel and startling proposition. Where is the line of demarkation to be drawn? Our ancestors said it was the inalienable right of all men to participate in their government. There was no restriction, no limitation. All, so they said, were entitled to this blessing; and yet in the Senate of the United States the monstrous doctrine is advanced that a few men alone are entitled to participate in the government. Where, I ask again, is the line of demarkation to be drawn? Is it to be placed on religious, on political, on personal, or on educational ground? No, the doctrine was monstrous in its conception and it would be disastrous in its consequences if applied.

I desire to call attention to a remark of the senior Senator from Virginia, made on Saturday last, presenting an argument with which I cannot agree and in which I do not concur. That Senator said that the power to acquire territory exists as incident to the war-making power, which is correct, and then

he said territory could be acquired by treaty and by cession. There are but two ways to acquire territory under the Constitution—one as an incident of the war-making power and the other by virtue of the treaty-making power. What is a cession but a treaty? It is, as the law books say, a treaty of cession, just as we speak of a treaty of commerce or a treaty of amity and peace. There is no way known among men, under a government like ours, of acquiring territory except as an incident of the power to make war and by virtue of the power to make treaties with foreign nations.

The Senator said the difference between a treaty and a cession was this: That a treaty carried with it certain inter-dependent obligations binding upon both parties, while a cession was no more than a deed of quittance or a release to the party receiving it. That is like the impossible distinction made by some law writers between a bilateral and a unilateral contract. You can scarcely open a law book that treats on the subject of contracts that you will not find refinements and distinctions between a bilateral and a unilateral contract; and yet, in my judgment, there is not the slightest distinction between such contracts, for every contract, whether it be signed, every contract, whether it be partly in writing or rests partly in parole, is a contract that carries with it obligations and duties on the part of the respective parties. So, I assert again that the sole power possessed by this Government to acquire territory is by virtue of the war-making power and the treaty-making power.

I have no doubt, as declared by the resolutions under consideration, that in permanently acquiring territory we would do so with the view of incorporating its inhabitants into our population as citizens. All through

the history of our acquisition of territory, beginning with Louisiana in 1803 and ending with the Hawaiian Islands, our ancestors have understood, and we, too, that we hold the acquired territory in trust for statehood. So our law writers and so our jurists have declared from time to time. We have no power, in my judgment, to hold the Filipinos as vassals. We have no right to deprive them, whatever they may be, of the right of self-government if they desire it. It would be ruinous, in my judgment, if we sought to do so.

We are confronted to-day in our own country with a great race problem, that must be solved soon if it is not to bring us trouble. We have conditions existing in certain sections of the Union that can not always continue. It will be the part of wise and conservative statesmanship for the American statesmen to deal with this problem in a few years. Are we now prepared, under these circumstances, to take within our population 12,000,000 people alien in race, alien in language and in purposes to a great popular government like ours? I challenge any gentleman on this floor on either side of the Chamber, I care not who he may be, to point out the authority this Government would have, when the Philippines are annexed to the United States, to restrict the expatriation of those people and their immigration here. There is no power to prevent it. The moment we permanently annex those islands to this country and they become a district or a Territory of the United States, that moment we extend our jurisdiction over them and over the people, and those people will have as much right to come into the District of Columbia or to settle in any State of this Union as I have to pass from Nebraska to Iowa or any other part of our common country.

It may be that there is a sinister motive in this; it may be that there are those who contemplate the rapid approach of the time when this debased population can be brought here and thrown in deadly contact with the laboring men of our country. I ask the Republicans of this Chamber what will become of your tariff laws under such circumstances? You have said to the laboring man of this country for more than a quarter of a century that a protective tariff is a blessing to him. You have made many of them believe it. Of course it was never intended to benefit the manufacturer, according to your argument. The manufacturer, the man who reaps the benefit from a protective tariff, has been sedulously excluded from the argument; but the tariff was to reach its strong arms around the laboring men and protect them and their families.

You said to them in 1896 that you wanted this country protected from the pauper laborer of Europe and the manufactured articles of pauper labor, and yet by annexation you will open wide the door to an endless horde of nondescript population that can come to your very doors in spite of all you can do, in deadly contact with the laborer of this country, debasing the civilization of himself and his family. You will simply move the factory from the United States to Manila and the Hawaiian Islands. And what, too, will become of the Chinese-exclusion acts? They will be swept away and a resistless tide of cheap labor admitted.

I may disagree with the distinguished gentleman who is at the head of this Government at the present time, as I do. But, I do it honestly, because I believe many of his policies are wrong. I am not to be driven from my position because some portion of my constituency may not approve of my views.

I would rather take my station in the obscurest community of my State and devote the remainder of my life to eking out an existence by the most onerous manual labor than to surrender to any man, high or low, or to any organization or party, an honest, conscientious conviction of duty.

We must not shut our eyes to the dangers that confront us. Let it be once understood that we are to abandon the domestic policy that has been ours throughout the years of our national existence and embark on the uncertain sea of imperialism, to become "a power," whatever that may be, of the world, and our institutions that have been held dear for more than a century and a quarter, our flag that has floated in triumph over every foot of our common country and that has ridden the storms of the sea in triumph and in glory will be hauled down not only in Manila, but in this country as well. Can we afford to take the risk? Can we afford to incur the danger?

I hold that the foreign policy to be pursued by this Government must inevitably be a policy incident to and in aid of a strong domestic government. Such was the declaration of Hamilton himself. It was said in one of his articles in the Federalist that in the very nature of things a republic can never have an aggressive foreign policy. He said its safety was to be found in its isolation and in its compactness, for, said that great man further, in a republic like the United States, where the administration is changing every four years, a policy that is aggressive, that believes in the forcible colonization of other lands, may, by the election of a Chief Magistrate holding different views, be overturned and changed.

The news has come to us within the last few hours of a conflict between the American Army and Navy and the Filipinos. To my own State has fallen much

of the loss of life and limb. Ten out of twenty of the young men who lost their lives in the battle that has been fought in the last forty-eight hours were members of the First Nebraska Infantry. There is mourning in Nebraska to-day; there will be weeping at the hearthstone of many a Nebraska home to-night. This ought to be a warning to us.

We are in the Philippine Islands as a conquering military power. We hold them to-day by virtue of the power to make war, and in no other sense, and there those islands and those people must remain respecting the law, respecting the dignity and the sovereignty and the flag of this nation until their status among the nations of the earth shall be defined. But if we are to hold them, if in time they are to come completely within our jurisdiction, we must not refuse them the ordinary privileges and immunities of an American citizen.

If prayer be a sincere desire of the human heart, I fervently pray that this great danger may be averted and this complex question may be solved in justice and in honor to our nation and in justice and in honor to the conquered. Those islands and those people must not be surrendered to Spain. Spain has lost her jurisdiction over them and over the islands of the Western Hemisphere forever. God grant the day may speedily come when Spain, unless she changes her civilization, shall be blotted from the map of nations. God grant the day when the Filipinos and the inhabitants of Porto Rico and Cuba may rise to a true conception of the duties and obligations of citizenship; when they, too, with the encouragement of this great and powerful Republic, shall take their station among the civilized republics and peoples of the earth.

CHAPTER XXVI.

“LEST WE FORGET.”

BY CHARLES A. TOWNE,

EX-REPRESENTATIVE OF CONGRESS FROM MINNESOTA.

Not so much by formal provision of law as by the grateful and reverent affection of the American people, this anniversary is consecrated to the memory of Washington. A name not unknown or unadored in the world that is even older yet, though it make our newest problems for us, for out of Asia comes to-day a cry startling the silence of abysmal centuries and echoing a prophecy of long ago, when our Aryan progenitors began their restless progress round the globe, the cry of a struggling people imploring the freedom wherewith we ourselves are free and invoking the venerated shade of Washington to witness between us and them.

This day, 167 years ago, George Washington was born, and ere this year be passed time will have marched a century from his grave. It is my humble but firm opinion that not since his death has the advent of his birthday been marked by circumstances so novel, so interesting, so momentous and sinister as now. Not in all that time has there arisen a crisis in the history of this country so needful of his wisdom, so apt to his counsel, and so menacing to his glory, as that which to-day confronts the Republic that was founded by his valor and that has touched the heights of greatness through obedience to his precepts.

Profoundly convinced that as a democracy we have reached the parting of the ways, and that upon the decision by the American people of problems now imminent depends the future weal or woe of our country, and hence that of the human race for ages to come, I propose to speak out plainly and emphatically as to what, in my judgment, the present situation is and means and as to what it is incumbent on the citizens to do in respect of it. I adopt this course the more freely to-day, inasmuch as the main question has not yet become a partisan issue and thus rendered, as to many persons, unapproachable by honest inquiry and insusceptible of unprejudiced consideration; albeit, as I have observed with infinite regret, a very great number of people have already jumped at conclusions in this important matter, actuated solely by what seemed to be from day to day the tendency of their party leadership.

I am quite aware, my friends, that by a considerable proportion of the public press the language of distrust of present tendencies is ridiculed as a form of hysteria or denounced as an attack on the Government, and that a man who ventures to raise a cry of warning is either charitably characterized as a fit candidate for a lunatic asylum or violently assailed as an enemy of his country. It has been long, however, since such opposition lost its terrors for me; and I shall bear with cheerful resignation my share of whatever opprobrium shall continue to be heaped upon those, who on this subject, are outspoken and resolute.

It is usually difficult to estimate the drift and force of the currents of social and political change. Their ordinary flow is so still and regular as not to attract the attention of any but the closest observer, so that

his accounts of the results of his observations are met with general apathy or incredulity. But now and then events occur that so accelerate the speed of tendencies as to make them obvious to common scrutiny. Wars, for example, are such events. It is as if suddenly the restraint of banks and counter currents were swept away and the dominant flow became a torrent. At such a time there is need of cool heads. The general disposition is to go with the stream, and those who before drifted unconscious of direction now madly abandon themselves to the course, calling it Providence and themselves the children of destiny.

Edmund Burke once said that no war ever leaves a nation where it found it. This is true in many ways, but in none more significantly than in respect of the dispositions and even the inherited instincts of men. A forceful illustration is the recent war with Spain. Thousands of humdrum citizens to whom one little year ago even Porto Rico seemed far beyond our natural sphere of influence, are to-day clamoring for the annexation of the Philippines, whose geographical whereabouts were then no better known to them than those of the Islands of the Blest, and about which even now many of them have notions very little more definite than is their knowledge of Swat or Timbuctoo. A few, indeed, there are among us that not long ago, considering the multiplying difficulties of industrial and economic problems, were gravely doubtful of the ability of democratic institutions to maintain themselves on this continent, but who now, led by what reasoning and justified by what consistency I know not, are eager to complicate an already desperate situation with a whole hemisphere of novel perils.

An American Senate that solemnly declared less than a year since that our occupation of Cuba, the

very territory which was the subject and the inevitable theater of war, should be confined to the pacification of the island, refused a few days ago to give its assent to a straightforward resolution disclaiming any intention to exercise permanent sovereignty in the Philippines, which were in no way associated with the cause of the war and only incidentally involved in its prosecution.

An American President who, in April, 1898, went reluctantly to war for the liberation of one people, proclaimed in January, 1899, the subjugation "by conquest" of another people, and is to-day engaged by sea and land in forcing the authority of this great Government upon an inoffensive race struggling to be free and vainly interposing between their naked bodies and our merciless guns the familiar and once respected guaranties of the Declaration of Independence.

Ah! what a fall is here, my countrymen. Within the circuit of a single year to have declined from the moral leadership of mankind into the common brigandage of the robber nations of the world.

The contest out of which it is claimed there comes to us this Christian duty of slaughter and subjugation began nobly. Not since the devoted manhood of Europe in holy enthusiasm vowed to redeem the tomb of the Saviour from the pollution of the infidel has history witnessed so chivalrous and unselfish a war as that which was commenced by the people of the United States to free the island of Cuba from the tyranny of Spain. It was not to be a war of conquest. Orators in and out of Congress pictured in glowing colors the disinterestedness of our action. The newspapers vied with one another in strengthening the doctrine of international law justifying intervention on grounds of humanity. The pulpit added its fervid sanction to the high resolves of the new crusade.

In the resolutions that practically constituted a declaration of war the purpose of this Government was clearly expressed to be the expulsion of all Spanish authority from Cuba and the achievement of the freedom and independence of the island; and the famous fourth resolution was as follows:

That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

The brave deeds of our soldiers and sailors that followed this declaration shone with a special glory because of it. For it is the object of a war that characterizes it. Unjust wars are never glorious. While it is true that the history of warfare on the land records few finer exhibitions of personal bravery than those witnessed on the hill of San Juan, and that the naval battles of Manila and Santiago will sustain comparison with the most famous engagements of the greatest captains of the sea, yet succeeding ages will recall that what, in the ability and heroism of Dewey and Schley and Roosevelt and their brave associates, added a new title to the grateful remembrance of mankind was the consciousness of facing death in every awful form to win the prize of liberty for an alien people. Let us make them secure in this high heritage. Let us see to it that the chaplets placed upon their brows by the genius of self-sacrifice be not withered by the touch of greed or stained with the blood of innocence.

The possession of the Philippine Islands was in no way necessary to the success of the war nor within its purpose. Admiral Dewey went to Manila in pursuance of his well-known instructions to "find the Spanish fleet and destroy it." In his subsequent oper-

ations he was assisted by the insurgent Filipinos, who were engaged, like the rebels of Cuba, in an effort to throw off the yoke of Spain, if possible a more heavy burden and a more odious tyranny in the Philippines than in the Antilles.

Said Admiral Dewey on the 27th of June: "I have given the insurgents to understand that I consider them as friends, because we oppose a mutual enemy." The publications of the Government show beyond all cavil that, whatever mental reservations the Washington authorities may have found it consistent with their ideas of honorable diplomacy to entertain, our representatives immediately in contact with Emilio Aguinaldo and his coadjutors treated the insurrectionists as allies and that we were honorably bound to respect the relation. Such was the situation when they organized a government, declared themselves free and independent, adopted a constitution, raised and maintained an army, collected revenues, conducted military operations according to the laws of war, and captured and held many thousands of Spanish prisoners. During all this time they made no mystery of the sacred object of their endeavor. They were striving for independence, for the overthrow of the Spanish power and the establishment of a Philippine republic. They eagerly welcomed the sailors and soldiers of the United States, and gladly accepted and returned our assistance. My friends, if under such circumstances we harbored against our allies a secret intention of snatching from their grasp the hard-won reward of all their suffering and valor as soon as it should come within their reach; if we deceived and profited by their confidence only to force upon them the milder though scarcely less welcome overlordship of the United States in the place of the Spanish despot-

ism they rebelled against; if, in short, we led these people up to a near view of freedom only at last to give them a change of masters, then may God forgive us and in some way shield us from the retribution we deserve and that all history teaches us we must else receive! For such an act would be worse than Punic faith, a deed without a name, in the presence of which the garnered trophies of a hundred years would fall to ashes and the sun of the Republic set in blackness forever.

The peace protocol was signed August 12, 1898, and by it, while Spain expressed a willingness to relinquish her sovereignty over Cuba and to cede Porto Rico to the United States, which points were subsequently confirmed by the treaty, the following provision was made as to the Philippines:

Art. 3. The United States will occupy and hold the city, bay, and harbor of Manila pending the conclusion of a treaty of peace which shall determine the control, disposition, and government of the Philippines.

Thus, until the matter should be finally settled by the treaty of peace, the status of the parties in the Philippines was determined by the protocol and fixed as of its date, August 12. The attack by the troops of the United States upon the city was not made until the next day, August 13, and the formal capitulation occurred on the 15th. Whatever under other circumstances might have been the effect of the capture of the city of Manila upon the sovereignty of the entire group of islands, and whether or not it would have passed that sovereignty to the United States, it is clear that after the execution of the protocol the capture could not possibly confer any rights beyond the provisional occupation of the city, the bay, and the harbor of Manila. When, therefore, the President of the United States says, as he recently has said, that our

possession of the Philippine Islands rests upon the "right of conquest," he is certainly in error. When he signed the protocol he expressly bound this country to determine the ultimate fate of those islands by negotiation. Such, as a matter of fact, is the manner in which it has been done. Article III of the treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898, "cedes to the United States the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands;" and that it may more clearly appear to have been the result of "negotiation" rather than of "conquest," the same article of the treaty provides for the payment to Spain of \$20,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States. It is all "hire and salary, not revenge." We have not wrested the Filipinos from Spain; we have bought them. Theirs is not even the poor satisfaction of figuring among the spoils of honorable war. They are the sorry chattels of a higgling bargain and sale between the bankrupt monarchy of Charles V and the recreant Republic of George Washington.

The condition of affairs in the Philippine Islands at this moment constitutes an ineffaceable stain upon the honor of this country. Having bought out the shadowy and unstable authority of Spain we have succeeded to her equity in this rebellion, or rather let us say to her inequity, for we have long since given full recognition of the justice of the rebellion. Oh! the magic power of gold. By paying \$20,000,000 of it we have transformed patriotism into treason, our allies into rebels. The very men whose aspirations for liberty a few short months ago we supported with our Army and Navy we are to-day engaged in shooting to death. By the light of the burning villages about Manila and of Iloilo let us read the following language from the President's proclamation made public by

General Otis on the 5th of last month: "The mission of the United States is one of beneficent assimilation." And in confirmation of this benevolent disposition let us read again from his Cuban message of April 11, 1898: "I speak not of forcible annexation, for that can not be thought of; that, by our code of morality, would be criminal aggression." For saying this and then doing what we have done we shall hardly escape the revenges of history.

But it is said that the present hostilities were begun by the Filipinos. The facts are not quite so well authenticated as could be wished, especially in view of the claim of Agoncillo that the Americans were the aggressors and precipitated the difficulty for the purpose of influencing the then pending vote in the United States Senate on the treaty ratification, and considering also the vigilant censorship of the cable maintained by our military authorities. But accepting the statement as true, where rests the ultimate responsibility? Does it not lie against us for not having long before given to the people of those islands an assurance that they should have the right of instituting and maintaining a government of their own? That is what they have been fighting Spain for. That is the only thing they desire. Why was not the assurance given? My answer is, because the powers that be in this country did not intend to allow the Filipinos to govern themselves, and will never hereafter grant them their independence unless compelled to do so by the liberty-loving people of the United States.

What are the evidences of this? The hurrying of reinforcements to the Philippines, the negotiation of a treaty providing for the cession to us of sovereignty over the islands; the persistent refusal of the Government to make any definite announcement of a policy

when a word consistent with the natural and just expectations of our former allies would have been a perfect guaranty of peace; the reiterated demand of the President and certain Senators to know who would "haul down the flag;" and the refusal of the Senate to pass a simple resolution similar to that in which, at the outbreak of the war, assurance was given to Cuba that we would not exercise permanent jurisdiction in that island but would withdraw upon the accomplishment of its pacification and leave its government and control to its people. Such a proclamation even now by the Executive of this Government, or, better yet, a declaration to that effect in a joint resolution of both Houses of Congress, signed by the President, would instantly re-establish peace in the distracted Philippines.

But such a procedure would interfere with the programme which, wherever it originated, seems now tolerably well determined upon. It is proposed to establish a colonial empire founded upon force and maintained by military occupation. Governor Roosevelt says that the Filipinos "must be made to realize absolutely that we are their masters." General Merritt is reported as saying: "We must go at the matter systematically and whip them so soundly that they will make no further question of the ability of the United States to do what she pleases." He adds: "I believe that we should adopt the English colonial system. * * * The Filipinos should be ruled over by a military resident or governor, having practically absolute power." Senator Davis, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and one of the Paris peace commissioners, has also declared that in his judgment the government of the Philippines should be along the general lines of that of the English crown colonies,

Nobody proposes to form states out of these islands nor to erect them into Territories preparatorily to statehood. Situated in the Tropics they can never become colonies in the true sense, because our people can not occupy and possess them. The only alternative to granting them their freedom and the right, subject to a limited protectorate by the United States, to establish and maintain a government of their own, is to hold them indefinitely as a subject nation—as a dependency under military control.

The objections to any such system are numerous and very serious, although the present occasion will permit reference to only a few of them. Waiving now the question of power, although I think it plain that under the Constitution there is no authority in the Government of the United States to establish a colonial system, overwhelming considerations of the highest duty and expediency seem to me absolutely to condemn the project and to counsel the obligation, wisdom, and advantage of permitting the Filipinos to organize and maintain a free, stable, and independent government of their own under the protectorate of the United States.

It is not too late to do this. The unfortunate breaking out of hostilities between us and them does not commit us to the extermination of the Filipinos. It is never too late to be just. There is no obligation upon this great nation, such as might to an inconsequential state seem to arise out of a false sense of pride, to carry on the slaughter already begun. It is still possible to listen to the dictates of humanity, and it ought to be easy to do so when humanity squares with interest. The ratification of the treaty, now practically complete except as to the exchange of formalities, has made the question a domestic one. In his speech at

Boston the other night the President said that the subject now rests with the American people; and surely we should be broad enough and big enough to deal with it in a spirit of sobriety and righteousness. There is a disposition in some quarters to regard the whole matter as finally disposed of by the formal acceptance of sovereignty over the Philippines under the treaty; and unquestionably it well suits the designs of certain persons to propagate that impression as widely as possible. But this status can not be permitted to remain. The conscience of our people will revolt against a war of "criminal aggression" in the Philippines. Even they who counseled violence in the beginning will be compelled by awakening public sentiment to accept accommodation by and by, making merit of a tardy virtue in the spirit of that character of Euripides who says, "If it be needful to resort to injustice in order to attain power, let us have recourse to it; but under all other circumstances let us be honest."

The whole scheme of colonialism is out of harmony with our institutions. It belongs to imperialism, not to republicanism. No republic ever ruled colonies otherwise than oppressively. It has been repeatedly pointed out that the attempt led to the downfall of the Athenian democracy and transformed the Republic of Rome into an empire. There would be an infinite demoralization to domestic peace and progress in the contemplation of a portion of our domain cut off from the privileges of liberty and the rights of self-government. Every advance that freedom has ever made has been gained by sacrifice and maintained only by vigilance. History and analogy teach us that tyranny would sooner travel from the Philippines to the United States than liberty would travel from the United States

to the Philippines. It is amazing to notice to what an extent even the tentative establishment of absolutism in the Philippines has corrupted public sentiment at home. It has already lowered the high ideals of the olden time. It has taught many of us a new language, the language of the despot and the bully. Mr. Murat Halstead, a distinguished newspaper writer and public educator, after a visit to the islands, gave a careful estimate of the difficulties of governing them, and declared that in his judgment a relatively small army "could hold the Filipinos in subjection." One of our great newspapers quotes a prominent army officer, lately returned from the Philippines, as declaring it to be necessary for us to sweep the inhabitants into the sea. The illustrious chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate recently said in a speech, referring to the Filipinos: "I would bring them up tenderly, but in chastisement, if we must."

Upon reflection it must seem to all of us monstrous that men living in the Great Republic, and after a hundred years of the benign and salutary sway of our Constitution, can use language like that which I have quoted. Why, our fathers, in words that rang around the world and, even if we prove recreant, shall echo through all time, declared that the power which it is now proposed we should use over the Filipinos can never, under any circumstances, be rightfully exercised by anybody over anybody else. Almost every line of the Declaration of Independence is an indictment against this proposed system of misgovernment in the Philippine Islands.

Thoughtful men can not have failed to notice, what has seemed to me a most unhappily significant thing, to what lengths some of our American statesmen have gone in an anxiety to construe the Constitution as

authorizing the acquisition and government of dependencies wholly without restraint and as clothing Congress and the President with a power as absolute as despotism itself. Is it not ominous, the bare fact that men feel impelled to make an argument like that? It must be that they have forgotten how and why the Constitution was framed and upon what theory it rests. In the preamble of that instrument the purpose of the exercise of all the powers conferred by it was stated in the following memorable words:

To form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity.

A distinguished judge of the United States Supreme Court has said, in rendering a decision of that tribunal, that it is always safe to read the letter of the Constitution in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence. How will the advocates of the employment of an irresponsible rule over the Philippines justify their attitude in the face of the sublime and inspired proposition that governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and of the limitation of the authority of the National Government to the broad and beneficent objects recited in the preamble?

The tendency to which I have just referred goes far to justify the apprehensions of those people who regard it as not widely impossible that gradual abuses of power must ultimately lead not only to the destruction of the guaranties of our constitutional liberty, but to an actual assumption by the Government of imperial forms. There is not, indeed, much difference between the statement of some of our eminent generals respecting the necessity of a magnificent and crushing exercise of force over the Filipinos in order to impress them sufficiently with a conception of the hope-

lessness of resistance, and the following statement of Beaconsfield in the House of Lords in support of his bill to confer upon Queen Victoria the title of Empress of India:

It is only by the amplification of titles that you can often touch and satisfy the imagination of nations, and that is an element which governments must not despise.

There is also noticeable a growing disposition to magnify the office of the Presidency. All will recall how Congress at the beginning of hostilities with Spain voted the sum of \$50,000,000 to the President to be expended absolutely at his discretion; and it is only a few days since that Representative of the Congressional majority proposed to clothe the Chief Magistrate with the discretionary powers of determining whether the Standing Army should consist of 50,000 or 100,000 men. Nothing has been more common in the course of the recent debates, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, than for prominent statesmen to attempt to explain the absence of any legislative plan of action by the fact that the President has not yet declared his policy. This last circumstance is but one example of many that might be offered to exhibit the gradual and, in the aggregate, tremendous aggrandizement of the power of the President, a tendency very marked in recent years, and sufficiently ominous in the ordinary development of our democratic system. The question relates itself to far too large an inquiry for present consideration; but I desire earnestly to direct attention to it as fraught with the greatest future importance. While I desire not to be thought an alarmist, yet in my opinion the citizens of the country can not be too frequently reminded, in the language of an American adage, that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and that

freemen can not view with too careful a jealousy even the slightest excess of constitutional authority.

To set up a colonial system is to be ready to trade peace for war, to surrender serenity and security for a state of armed anxiety and weakening incertitude. It is to mix up in alien quarrels, which we have deprecated always and with special emphasis of late, at precisely the time when by all indications they are about to culminate in the most colossal and destructive war of modern times. Not long ago, at the lord mayor's banquet in London, Lord Salisbury declared that the advent of the United States into Old World diplomacy would greatly strengthen England, but his lordship added that he was sorry that, in his opinion, it did not improve the prospects of peace. The sensitive storm center is in the East, and into the very midst of it we should be led by this fatuous policy of empire.

The imperial policy will necessitate a vast increase in our naval establishment and, especially and most serious, the creation and maintenance of a great standing army. Nothing can excuse the apparent indifference of a large part of our people to this consideration. The men from whom we drew our political lineage were exceedingly apprehensive of the danger to free institutions that always lurks in a large standing army. Washington not only voiced the sentiment of his time, but one of the lessons of all history, when in his Farewell Address he said:

Avoid the necessity of these overgrown military establishments which, under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty.

How discouraging to the hopeful lover of peace it is to witness the United States, hitherto the great exemplar of peace, preparing to undertake the ruinous burden of standing armies just when Europe is about

to go into counsel over disarmament, and to see her putting on the helmet of Mars at the very time when the Czar, the War Lord of the North, is inviting the nations to the Temple of Concord.

This dream of empire can not be realized without a prodigious increase in the expenses of the Government, to be borne with difficulty by the people without recompense through any corresponding advantage. The best authority fixes the proportions of this imperial increment at about \$200,000,000 a year. Inasmuch as the cost of our war with Spain was not far from \$175,000,000, the anomalous conclusion is reached that it would be cheaper for us by \$25,000,000 a year to fight for peace than to maintain it after we get it. These figures should prove interesting reading for the people of this country who witness the expenditures of National Government mounting fast toward \$2,000,000,000 per Congress, and who have recently been authoritatively assured that the so-called "war taxes" must continue indefinitely, and that, notwithstanding the raising of more than \$170,000,000 in this manner and the sale of \$200,000,000 of bonds, there will be a deficit in the national revenues at the end of the present fiscal year close to \$180,000,000.

The interest of labor in this great subject is important and immediate; and the leaders of that peaceable and powerful army do well to attack this imperial programme now instead of waiting until they are actually confronted by questions arising out of the immigration of cheap oriental workmen from our new possessions, or presented by the importation from thence of goods made in American factories in the Philippines to compete in our market at home with the products of the toil and skill of American freemen.

But the chief and all-sufficient reason, as it seems

to me, why it is unspeakable folly for the United States to erect a permanent colonial dependency in the Philippine Islands is that it will distract our attention from the study and solution of the gravest social, economic, and industrial problems in our domestic life, and must needlessly multiply the tasks of democratic government at exactly the time when, in its natural development, it is being subjected to a crucial strain.

We are constantly reminded by writers of great learning and insight, like the historian Lecky, Sir Henry, Maine, Mr. E. L. Godkin, and Professor Hyslop, that democracy is still in the experimental stage. It seems to me a folly bordering on lunacy that men should now soberly propose to add the burdens that have invariably crushed every other republic in the history of the world that assumed them to those under which the people of this country are already staggering, doubtful of solving them to the credit and glory of democratic institutions. Their temerity will be appreciated if we barely enumerate, without pausing to discuss, some of the chief problems before which the genius of our Republic has already paused: Questions of municipal government; of just taxation; of the equitable distribution of produced wealth; of the administration of natural monopolies, and the control of artificial combinations of capital in trusts and otherwise, and the organization of labor; racial problems; and the abuses of our partisan political system with its evolution of boss tyranny, official irresponsibility, and public apathy. Until these questions are settled we have "room and verge enough" at home. Let us not be deceived by the specious plea of "duty." Our greatest, until we shall have made much more progress in them, practically our only, duty is with these im-


mediate, immense domestic problems; and not for ourselves alone, but for all mankind.

So far as I have observed, little attempt has been made in the way of affirmative argument by the advocates of the imperialistic programme. By so managing as to set the Government drifting inevitably toward their object, so that if nothing at all be done we shall find ourselves perforce in due time completely given over to their policy, they have shrewdly maneuvered the burden of proof upon their antagonists. When circumstances compel them to utterance, the results, if I may be permitted in all candor to say so, are exceedingly disappointing. It would seem as if so momentous a departure from our ancient and traditional policy ought to be justified by very weighty considerations. On the contrary, however, they are for the most part of such a character as to remind one, when observing the aspect and demonstrations of the audiences to whom they are addressed, of what Cleon said of the Athenian democracy under somewhat similar circumstances: "That as they listened to the orators for expansion they resembled men sitting to be amused by rhetoricians rather than deliberating on state affairs."

Vague mention is made by them of supposed commercial advantages to accrue to the United States from the acquisition of the Philippines. When it is remembered that the total foreign trade of the islands is only about \$30,000,000 a year, and that under the so-called "open door" policy which the great commercial nations have introduced in their colonial management, and which we have already announced we propose to pursue, we can increase our share of this precisely as well without owning the islands as we can by owning them, and without any of the expense entailed by the



Horace Boies



J. C. Blackburn

latter policy, this contention thins to a vanishing point. So far as Chinese and oriental trade in general is concerned, the maintenance of a coaling station in Luzon, which could easily be arranged, would afford all the facilities that full possession of the archipelago would give. Under modern colonial policies the tendency of trade is not, as it was in the era of navigation laws and similar monopoly regulations, to "follow the flag," but to seek the avenues of least resistance and of greatest profit to those conducting it. The way to augment our trade is to undersell our competitors, to increase the desirability of our goods, and to improve our consular arrangements and foreign business methods. Yankee ingenuity and mechanical skill, which have already trebled our exports to China during the last eight years, while England was doubling hers, will do infinitely more for our commerce than the costly purchase of a market of which we can possess no more after paying the price than would be freely ours without it.

It is said that the home market is overstocked; that there is a glut of all kinds of goods, due to overproduction, and that what the American citizen can not eat and wear must be worked off on the Malay and the Chinamen. Nothing better than this claim illustrates the baselessness of the imperialistic argument. I assert with all confidence that under a proper distribution of the burdens of government and opportunities of wealth in the United States no more of the comforts and luxuries of life can be created by American skill than can be profitably consumed and wisely enjoyed by American manhood, American womanhood and childhood. When men freeze at the mouth of the coal mine and starve in front of the bake shop, when the per capita consumption of wheat decreases as popu-

lation multiplies, when millions of our citizens lack roof and raiment, to say that there is an overproduction of the necessaries of life is both an economic absurdity and an arraignment of our American civilization at the bar of humanity and justice.

The attempt is made to fire the imagination of the people with much talk of the opportunity now presented to us of becoming a "world power." Why, my friends, what is it to be a "world power?" Is it not to be a power in the world; and if so, where is there a greater "world power" than the United States, or than she has been for more than a hundred years? During all that time America has carried the torch that has lighted the pathway of liberty for the nations of the earth. Our reaction upon Europe has crumbled dynasties to dust and above the graves of privilege has reared republics and parliaments. Within that century nearly 500 constitutions have been born, none of which would have been possible but for ours. The South American Republics, not coddled into perpetual infancy, but defended in natural, self-taught, and therefore sure progress, have risen up and called us blessed. Wherever representative government has been planted, wherever new guaranties of personal security and political rights have been won, wherever religious liberty has widened and the freedom of the press increased, there has been witnessed the force of American example, which, though gentle as the "sweet influence of the Pleiades," speaks louder than the thunder of our guns and moves with more resistless might than armies.

And what can empire offer us for this? A rivalry with swaggering kingdoms seeking loot and license of their weaker neighbors, snatching our share of plunder that we do not need, marching back three centuries

over the fallen and shattered idols of our storied progress, earning the fear of every victim and the jealous hatred of every rival, where we might have retained the love of the one and at least the respect of the other.

One of the last of the sage observations of the great Bismarck was elicited by the prospect of the Spanish war. Said he:

The result of the war can not be wholesome to Europe or America. The United States will be forced to adopt an intermeddling policy leading to unavoidable friction. * * * The American change of front means retrogression, in the high sense of civilization. This is the main regrettable fact about the war.

If, my friends, we do not resist and conquer the forces that are now setting toward an American empire in the eastern tropics, with its inevitable resultant imperialistic modification of our domestic institutions, the prophecy of Bismarck will surely become the judgment of history. It will be ours eternally to bear the odium of having stopped the car of progress and turned it backward. From so melancholy a reproach as that, it is, in my judgment, the duty of every true American to strive to the uttermost to save his country. To such high resolves, what time could give so deep and strong a sanction as the birthday of Washington? He was an American in every fiber of his being, devoted absolutely to his country, hopeful of her future, and profoundly attached to the Union under the Constitution. He believed in the legitimate growth of the United States, gave much time to the study of routes and waterways to the westward, along which he knew the tide of civilization was sure to set, and his prophetic vision foresaw the gradual assimilation of the continent by the spreading settlements from the earlier centers of population. Has the movement yet reached its limit? Is congested humanity

crowding us into the sea? Why, my friends, opportunities greater than all the orient, richer than "barbaric pearl and gold," await our enterprise, when it shall be disenthralled, within the present limits of the Republic. And when that shall have been subdued, the rest of this vast continent is ours by a law as certain in its result as it will be peaceable in its accomplishment. Were Washington alive to-day he would be to that extent an "expansionist;" but we may be sure that he who left to posterity the priceless political testament of the "Farewell Address" would as certainly and steadily have opposed imperialism in the form of a distant colonial dependency as he turned his back upon the offer of kingly power and "put away the crown."

As to the unavoidable accompaniment of an imperial policy in the way of alliances with other powers, his views have been left us in singular completeness and deliberation. The reasons on which they were based are as valid now as when he penned them. His utterance seems strangely prophetic of our present situation, and, though familiar from frequent citation, can not be recalled too often:

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. * * *

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly

hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interests, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world.

Ages and ages ago from the plains of Asia our Aryan forefathers turned their faces westward and entered upon that world-march whose record is the story of human progress. Their institutions grew as their journey lengthened, until at last we, their descendants, standing by the great sea from beyond whose farther shore their earth-round course began, are dowered with priceless constitutional liberties won by the struggles and sacrifices, the strenuous strife of muscle and brain and spirit, of six thousand years.

My friends, as we cross that ocean returning toward our ancestral home, what shall be our message to the peoples that were left behind? Shall it be peace or war, the cruelty and bondage of the empire or the friendship and freedom of the republic?

[Extract of address delivered on Washington's Birthday, 1899, at University of Michigan.]

CHAPTER XXVII.

ANNEXATION DANGEROUS TO LABOR.

BY HON. HORACE CHILTON,

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM TEXAS.

The pending treaty of peace between the United States and Spain, which has been made public by order of the Senate, contains three main articles. By Article I Spain relinquishes all claim of title to Cuba. By Article II Spain cedes to the United States the Island of Porto Rico and other islands under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies and the Island of Guam in the Ladrones. By Article III Spain makes like absolute cession of the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands and the United States agree to pay Spain \$20,000,000.

There are other dependent articles, the most important of which is, probably, Article VII, by which the two Governments relinquish all claim for indemnity on the part of either Government or its citizens against the other Government arising out of the troubles in Cuba, and in which the United States agree to settle such claims on the part of our citizens against Spain. This may develop into an obligation of many millions against our Government. The amount has not been ascertained nor even estimated with any approximate accuracy.

The first two articles of the treaty present no difficulties. We are satisfied with a relinquishment of Cuba to its own people. Few Senators object to taking a cession of Porto Rico, which lies in the Western

Hemisphere. The Island of Guam, in the Ladrone, is not more than two or three times as large as the District of Columbia, and contains a population of only four or five thousand. It is a convenient size for a coaling and naval station, and we would have no perplexities of government for future settlement.

The article relating to the Philippines is the one upon which our differences of opinion turn.

I am not an anti-expansionist. I believe that it is the duty and the interest of this country to widen its boundaries as time goes on. But I would not do this indiscriminately. In case of doubt, I would adhere closely to the policy of the forefathers. In my judgment the taking of the Philippines will bring peril both to the interests and the institutions of the American people. It is not an acquisition which will add to the comfort and glory of the Republic, like that of Louisiana, or Florida, or Texas, or New Mexico and California.

It seems to me a matter of astonishment that such a radical far-reaching responsibility should be courted upon the scantiness of the information which we possess in regard to the subject-matter of our acquisition.

Perhaps no Senator upon this floor ever set foot upon the Philippine Islands, and few will claim that they possess that grasp upon the case which they would feel necessary in an important private transaction.

We know in a general way that there are from 1,200 to 1,800 islands in the Philippine group, that four or five hundred of them are inhabited, and that a great many of them are so barren that they contain not a single soul. We know that there are from 7,000,000 to 12,000,000 people upon them. My own opinion is that there are nearer 7,000,000 than 12,000,000, be-

cause we know how customary it is to exaggerate the population of the Eastern nations.

There is no homogeneity among those people. Some profess one religion, some another. Some have never been under the actual sovereignty of Spain. They represent all grades of society from rank savages to the semi-civilized children of Spanish and Chinese fathers and native Malay mothers. A mere handful of Germans, English, and Spaniards are there, but they are so few that they need not be taken into account.

Now, the first thing which would have to be done after the United States went into the Philippines would be to bring the islands under settled rule. We would have to do what Spain, after three hundred years of trial, with all the instrumentalities of tyranny at her command, has been unable to do. We would need a great and growing army.

If we will confine our operations to Porto Rico and Cuba, no additions to our present Regular Army will be necessary. We need but few soldiers inside the present borders of the United States, and our existing military force can be spared largely for Porto Rico and Cuba. Porto Rico is small in area and at peace. That island can be policed by two or three companies of good soldiers. Nor is there great danger in Cuba.

The fact of the proximity of the United States to the West Indies, that our great power hangs over the islands like a mountain side, the hopelessness of making headway against this Government in a rebellion or insurrection, will deter those in Porto Rico and Cuba who might otherwise be factors in disturbance from doing anything in opposition to our just rule.

But, sir, when we go to the Philippine Islands a different problem is thrust upon us. We will need a standing army of European proportions, and with that standing army will come all the vast consequences of present and future expense, which the American people should never forget. We will have retired lists for Army and Navy officers expanding faster than we expand our dominion; we will have pensions piled on pensions to the latest generation; we will have our minds constantly fixed upon visions of war and conquest rather than peace and industrial advancement, and for years the Pacific cables will bring bloody news to the homes of America.

But, sir, after we go there, after we have subjected those islands under great stress and great expense to the Government of our country, what a complexity of social and political problems is brought to our doors. Take, for example, the labor problem.

There are two distinct dangers which it is hardly possible to avert. Those dangers are, first, the competition of the pauper laborers of the Philippine Islands who may come to our shores. The second is the danger of the competition of the pauper-made products sent out from the Philippine Islands to flood and disparage American markets.

It is hardly material to the consideration of this question whether the Philippine Islanders become citizens or not when they are admitted into the bounds of our Republic. All persons who are within the jurisdiction of this country have the free right of locomotion from one part of our dominion to another. Would it be within the power of Congress to say that an alien peacefully resident here should not go from one of our Territories to another?

We can keep aliens from coming here. That has been decided. That is a power of our sovereignty. We can expel aliens after they come here. That is a function of our sovereignty. But we have no power to interfere with the personal liberty of an alien as long as he remains under the protection of our Republic.

I will not speak at length of the question whether the sons and daughters of the Filipinos would become citizens of this country. The Supreme Court of the United States, in a case as late as the one hundred and sixty-ninth volume, had occasion to decide that the son of an alien Chinaman who was born in this country could not be excluded from our borders.

Blackstone lays down that great principle of Anglo-Saxon progress that one of the first attributes of personal liberty is the right of locomotion from one part of the domain to another. And upon original principles, as well as American authority, it is fairly deducible that whenever we take the Philippine Islanders under our jurisdiction the Supreme Court will hold that it is beyond the power of Congress to prevent them from passing between different parts of the territory of the United States. That has been the common construction of our Constitution for the last one hundred years.

But suppose the danger could be safeguarded by legislation. Where under our Constitution do you find the authority to keep the productions of the Filipinos, manufactured in their own homes, from coming unimpeded to the ports of the United States? In *Loughborough vs. Blake* (5 Wheat., 317), Chief Justice Marshall, speaking for the court, said:

"The eighth section of the first article [of the Constitution] gives to Congress the 'power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises,' for the purposes thereafter mentioned. This grant is gen-

eral, without limitation as to place. It consequently extends to all places over which the Government extends."

That is pretty strong.

"The power, then, to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises, may be exercised, and must be exercised throughout the United States. Does this term designate the whole, or any particular portion of the American empire?"

Chief Justice Marshall seems to have been something of an imperialist himself, and he uses that word so that it might not be said that he only meant to include the States of the Union or the organized Territories.

"Does this term designate the whole, or any particular portion of the American empire?"

He then goes on to answer the question:

"It [the United States] is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia, or the territory west of the Missouri, is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania."

You will remember the idea was advanced here a few days ago that there was some other power in Congress over unorganized territory than that which we had over organized Territories; but when this decision was rendered the greater part of the territory west of the Missouri River, to which Chief Justice Marshall referred, was unorganized territory. This language applies to all the territory, as he says, which belongs to the United States.

"The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania; and it is not less necessary, on the principles of our Constitution, that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises should be observed in the one than in the other. Since, then, the power to lay and collect taxes, which includes direct taxes, is obviously co-extensive with the power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises, and since the latter extends throughout the United States, it follows that the power to impose direct taxes also extends throughout the United States."

The same principle is practically outlined in the case of *Cross vs. Harrison*, 16 Howard. From a consideration of these opinions and the nature of our

Government and institutions, it would seem clear that whenever any territory is brought within this American "empire," so called, it becomes subject to the same constitutional principles which overrule Congress in regard to that which we now possess.

I can not believe that it is within the power of Congress to say that there shall be a rate of duty on foreign goods brought into the Philippine Islands differing from the duty on same goods when brought into Texas, Maine, or California, nor can national legislation fix a tariff on importations which pass from the Philippine Islands to other parts of this country higher than the tax on importations which pass from the Territory of Arizona or the District of Columbia into any existing State or Territory.

The laboring people of this country have caught the alarm. They understand the nature of this grave and radical departure.

Is it within the power of the Congress of the United States to-day to say that goods which come from Arizona to the District of Columbia shall pay a certain rate of duty or a certain rate of tax—I do not care what you call it—and that goods which come from Texas to the District of Columbia shall pay another rate? Certainly not.

I will quote part of section 8, Article I, of the Constitution:

* * * but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Now, if a tax was laid on goods brought from Manila to San Francisco or New York, even if not a duty or impost, it would fall within the definition of the word "excise," and would be invalid if higher than like excises on goods from other ports of our country to New York or San Francisco.

But I was about to show the views of our labor organizations in regard to this question. I received lately a protest from one of these bodies, which I will read in part :

"The undersigned delegates desire to present briefly the reasons why the Cigar Makers' International Union of America, an organization composed of 31,500 members, located in 357 cities and towns, is opposed to the annexation of the Philippine Islands by the United States.

"I. Because the bulk of the cigars manufactured in the Philippine Islands are sold at a price of \$5 to \$10 per thousand in United States currency. This statement is verified by Edward W. Harden, special commissioner, in his report on the financial and industrial conditions of said country (page 23).

"II. Because the exportation of cigars in 1896 from Manila amounted to 194,136,000, which, within a few years, under American energy and direction, would increase to the extent of endangering our home industry.

"III. Because the cheap labor of the islands, subsisting mostly on rice and vegetables, would enable a few manufacturers to flood the United States with this product, thus tending to paralyze our home market.

"IV. Because the development of the industry in the archipelago would throw thousands of Americans employed at making cigars out of work and reduce the standard of wages to the Asiatic level, which averages from 15 cents to 25 cents per day.

"V. Because all barriers that now limit competition between these producing forces would be swept aside, and new conditions created most disastrous to the moral, social, and material welfare of the American working people.

"VI. Because the annexation of the Philippine Islands will not change the Asiatic habits and customs of the laboring population, but will, in course of time, reduce the American standard of living to a level bordering on pauperism.

"VII. Because the welfare of 150,000 employees and small manufacturers and their families, depending upon this industry for a living in the United States, is of vastly more importance to the nation than the increase of commerce expected by a few commercial centers.

"VIII. Because it would nullify, in substance, the Chinese exclusion act, the alien contract labor law, and immigration laws, for which organized labor has contended for the last twenty-five years."

So long as the Philippine people are held in allegiance to the Government of the United States you can not deny them the privileges which pertain to other persons who owe allegiance to our Government. Congress has no power to make discriminations between the people who owe a common obligation to a common Federal sovereignty. This Government was founded upon the proposition that all who served the Republic should have equality of right.

And why are we asked to take up these dangers? Why are we asked to run the risk of admitting 500,000 Chinese and crossbreeds of Chinese and Mestizos into

this Republic, to say nothing of the vast Malay millions which stand behind them? In the Philippine Islands to-day are more than 500,000 Chinese and descendants of Chinese. They mainly inhabit the city of Manila and other towns.

Those people are laborers, merchants, and traders, and when we open the doors by the annexation of these islands we will bring into competition with our home people more alien pauper laborers than would come here in a hundred years under the ordinary operation of our immigration laws. And for what? For islands which, in my judgment, have been vastly exaggerated in fertility and value.

The commerce of the Philippines would no doubt improve under the touch of American energy, but at best it would make but a small figure in our national resources. The imports and exports of the United States are now more in a day than the imports and exports of the Philippines are in a year.

Men may deceive themselves by daydreams about securing a great trade in China and Japan from the standpoint of the Philippines. But I have seen town-lot booms before. I have seen sober men intoxicate themselves with visions of railroads whose charters alone tell the story of their existence and of great cities which the census taker never found.

A widening commerce with those far-off lands should ever be an object of our care. The gallant Perry, in old Democratic days, was the first man to unlock the doors of Japan to American trade.

But to propel that commerce it is not necessary to assume the responsibility of governmental administration.

I would not have this Government surrender all the advantages which come from our glorious Eastern

victory. I would ask one or more coaling and naval stations in the Philippines, so that hereafter, if we had unwilling trouble upon the sea, we might have a base of operations in that quarter of the world.

But I would rather have a treaty which gave free entry to American productions—yes, ten thousand times rather have it—than a profitless and never quiet sovereignty of the ignorant and mixed millions of the Philippines.

I have spoken of the internal difficulties which will present themselves. In my judgment, they form but the smallest part of the gravity of this situation. Whenever we go over into the Philippine Islands great external problems will loom up. What becomes of our Monroe doctrine? What is that Monroe doctrine? It is a beautiful principle, which blends the interests of all the people of the American republics to the south of us with the interests of this great nation.

In the interest of peace the United States will not undertake to dislodge European colonies already established, but their boundaries are fixed. *Ne plus ultra* is written for them, and neither by war, purchase, voluntary cession, vote of the people, nor in any other way shall a single foot of new territory upon this hemisphere be added to European dominion.

In some respects this is a hard doctrine, but it is a doctrine of virtue and necessity. To say to all the great powers of Europe that while you may talk about taking in new territory, you can not do this anywhere in North, South, or Central America is something to touch the pride of kings and emperors across the water. Suppose Germany should have some kind of a conflict with Brazil, and her war ships should lay siege to and capture Rio Janeiro, as Manila was cap-

tured by us, and Brazil, brought to her knees, was forced to treat for peace.

Suppose that the Brazilian Government, in order to make this peace, were to propose to cede Rio Janeiro to Germany as a part of the settlement. Could she do it? No. At that moment the great, strong voice of the American Republic would speak to the German Government, "Stay thy hand, for we are sworn that no government of the Old World shall ever hereafter acquire another foot of soil upon the domain of the new.

But the Monroe doctrine goes further. If the Venezuelan Government to-morrow should propose to sell out one-half of its territory to Germany or to Russia or to France, the Republic of the United States would intervene.

It would be hard to find a citizen of the Union who would give up that Monroe doctrine.

We will say to the powers of the Old World, "We will not allow you to acquire further possession in the Western Hemisphere." Yet we will take Porto Rico, and we reserve the right to take Haiti or Brazil or Cuba or any other part of North or South America when we think proper to do so.

But after saying this, after reserving that liberty, will we go across into Asia and enter into the wolfish rivalry for land over there, and will we take and keep all that we feel disposed to take and keep? I say that all the moral power that there has ever been in the Monroe doctrine will leave it whenever we are brought to that extremity.

There is a corollary from the Monroe doctrine which is stated by President Monroe himself and all the other great statesmen of America who expounded that doctrine. That deduction is that, while we will

not allow the governments of the Old World to add any further territory to their present colonies on this side of the water, neither will we take a hand in the affairs of the Old World, and when we abandon that position and go over into the Eastern Hemisphere we will discredit the Monroe doctrine during all time. The principle will have been extracted from it, its truth, beauty, and loftiness will have been lost, and it will become simply a doctrine of brute force on the part of the United States.

Again, when we go over into the Philippines we have thrown ourselves upon the red-hot stove of international politics in the Eastern Hemisphere. When we go over there we find, in the first place, that governments over there do not settle matters, each for itself. You find over there what is known as the concert of Europe. A short time ago Greece had a war with Turkey. Turkey overran Greece; and had it in her power to force terms upon the Grecian monarchy.

But the powers of Europe intervened. Russia, Germany, England, France, Austria, and Italy, forming the concert of Europe, intervened, and they said, "We are going to have something to say about how this treaty of peace shall be made." They demanded that the treaty of peace be settled according to certain principles; "the balance of power must be conserved;" and so Turkey, after she had won a conclusive victory over Greece, was obliged to submit to a treaty which was dictated by the six great powers of Europe.

So after the war between Russia and Turkey a few years ago, Russia was victorious and began to outline the terms of peace, but a dark figure loomed up—the concert of Europe—England, Germany, France, Austria, and Italy. A congress was called at Berlin,

a famous congress in the diplomatic history of the world. Beaconsfield and Bismarck and other great statesmen representing the countries of Europe were there, and though Russia had overpowered Turkey in actual battle, the treaty of peace was made upon compromise terms acceptable to the other great powers.

When we go to the Philippine Islands, we take our place on the Sea of China. France is there, England is there, Russia is there, Germany is there. We become close neighbors to all of the great powers of Europe, and with each neighbor striving to gain advantage in territorial acquisition. Trouble will be certain to ensue, and it will not be long in coming. In my judgment twenty years will not elapse until we will be driven into hostile conflict with one or all the great European nations.

What will be the main theater of the war? Where will the fighting take place? Inevitably in Chinese waters or upon Chinese territory.

Whenever we take the Philippine Islands within our jurisdiction, every man and every dollar of the American people will be consecrated to their defense. We will not let other countries take them from us, and we will have to defend them with all the power at our command. We will have to send our men and our munitions over there to carry on the war.

Now, I have great faith in the energy, in the ability, and in the strength of the American people. I know our resources are tremendous. But we must never lose sight of the important fact that one of the reasons why the other nations of the earth have heretofore been unwilling and unable to measure arms with the United States is because of the fact that we have stood here in a great continental area and serenity, and the

countries of the Old World could not find a place to strike us. They dared not seek to invade us, and hence they shrank from encountering the dangers of a war with this Republic.

But whenever we take the Philippine Islands we have furnished to the world a place to strike us. It will be our one weak point. If we enter into an alliance with England, as is proposed here by some, we will have to take part in the division of China or take side against the partition of China. In either case we will have to go across the sea and fight our future battles with the powers of the Old World at a place which they and not we will select.

In such a contest we will be at great disadvantage. A Russian Government railroad will soon be finished from St. Petersburg to the Pacific Ocean and Sea of China. It will be within the power of the Russian Empire to send train load after train load of soldiers from St. Petersburg—its capital—to its remotest limits, and debark them close to the Philippines or upon the soil of China. We can not transport our soldiers by railroad. We will have to load ships at San Francisco or at some other American port, and send our soldiers across the Pacific Ocean, make a landing, and then measure arms with the continental powers of the Eastern Hemisphere. The difference of facilities would be against us in proportions so tremendous that I shrink from such an undertaking.

We should take some observations from experience. I remember in reading history one very remarkable instance of the utter folly of enabling your adversary to select the theater of war. After Napoleon Bonaparte undertook to invade Russia and left his army bleeding upon her plains of snow, no power in Europe dared to undertake another Russian invasion. For

a half century Russia was deemed impregnable. But in an evil hour she set up certain rights upon the Black Sea. Then England and France saw their opportunity.

When Russia set up these rights upon the Black Sea, as a matter of course she had to enforce them. England and France found it in their power to select the place where the fighting should take place; and when the Crimean war ended Russia was forced to agree to a peace that cost her more prestige than any other event in her history. If we go to the Philippine Islands, transfer the forum of our wars in the future from our own continent to the Eastern Continent, it seems to me there could be nothing more perilous to our prestige than to undertake such a departure.

Who can measure the vast cost of such an experiment? It has been boldly avowed upon this floor that we should go into an alliance with England and fight Russia or Germany or any combination of European powers which should seek to partition the Chinese Empire. What does all that mean? It means war, indescribable, unending war. Why should we cast the American destiny upon a sea which is bound to bring our people into bloody conflict with the powers of the Old World? It is a dreadful responsibility to propose at this hour of our history.

The last civil war has already cost the people of the United States over \$10,000,000,000; the wars of Europe during the present century have cost the people of Europe over \$100,000,000,000, and the end is not yet. Shall we gather nothing from this experience? Shall we go headlong into a policy which has brought the European masses into a state almost equivalent to despair?

So dreadful has this burden grown that not long

ago the Czar of Russia proposed that there should be a general disarmament. They are going to have a conference. We all know that no disarmament will take place. The powers of Europe must keep up great standing armies to watch each other. Why watch each other? Because they are in close neighborhood. What brought on the war between the United States and Spain? It was because of the neighborhood of Cuba to this country. If Cuba had been 7,000 miles away, we would never have had war with Spain, and no crisis such as that which now faces us would exist.

Now, whenever we go to the Philippine Islands we become neighbors to France, to Russia, and to Germany, and the very fact of our neighborhood will keep us perpetually in danger of conflict. But it is said: If all this be true, why is it that England, France, Germany, and other countries are engaged in a mad race for colonial territory? The reasons are many; some of them partly sound and others purely the result of imitation.

England and Germany have for a long time been vexed with the problem of a superabundant population. England has gone so far, at different times, as to actually assist immigration to the United States and other parts of the world. An overcrowded population had to be provided for, so a colonial policy has been as much the result of this state of affairs as from any other cause.

Germany occupies the same situation. France has been led into the same policy on the theory of finding new markets, but those who have studied the problem maturely believe that France has not gained and will not gain anything from her experiment but disaster and loss of time and money.

Besides, all these countries are not self-sustaining. They do not have, like the United States, such a variety of soil and climate that within their own borders one industry can exchange its products for that of the other and a comfortable living be made practicable by all without calling into requisition foreign trade.

England and Germany could not live without the wheat which comes from other countries. They could not thrive without the cotton fields which grow in other countries, and the complete dependence of European nations upon the United States for these great staples of agricultural production in this country has long been the subject of discontent among the thinkers who rule English and German affairs.

Why should England, Germany, and France be held up to the United States as objects of our imitation? Why should it be proposed that we abandon the safe tenets of our fathers and start upon a rivalry with them in the greed for distant possessions?

Are laborers paid better in England and Germany than they are in the United States? Are the masses of Europe more comfortable than the masses of this Republic?

If we have done so much better, if in a hundred years we have reached a height of power which England and Germany have not attained in a thousand years, why should we abandon our policy for theirs?

Where has the world ever witnessed such another record as that made by this Union under the fostering principles we are now about to abandon?

But after the music and the march have passed by, after the dance of delirium has worn us out, there will come a time of reckoning and mourning. I can but think of what will fall to our people in future years. After we have vindicated, by great sacrifice of the

treasure and blood of America, our ability to measure arms with the powers of Europe in their schemes of colonization upon the Eastern Hemisphere, I feel that the good folks at home are going to be the sufferers for all time—sufferers in purse, sufferers in morals, sufferers in institutions.

The question is asked with an air of confidence, as if it presented a difficulty which could not be overcome, "What are you going to do with the Philippines?" It is even claimed here in debate that we possess only a choice of alternatives; on the one hand, to take the Philippines as a part of our territory, or, on the other, to leave them to the dominion of Spain. This is mere assumption. We should do neither one thing nor the other. If we were under no obligations to the present insurgent forces in the Philippines it would be our duty, in view of the principles so long and proudly held by this Government, to provide for independent government by the people concerned and leave them to their just destiny.

But the case is still stronger. The evidence published in connection with the treaty shows conclusively that Aguinaldo and his forces were of steady, valuable support to the American commanders. The same evidence shows that these people looked upon themselves as the allies of the United States and believed faithfully that they were to be the beneficiaries of a joint success. I know not how it may impress others, but there seems to me something shameful in now turning to the Filipinos and saying to them, "You were not our allies; you were our tools; you were the victims of our diplomacy. We were merely using you, and our consuls and commanders were instructed privately not to commit this Government in a way which would deny us the privilege of ordering

the fate of the Philippines without regard to your wishes."

Men talk about our moral duties to the world, about what we owe to England and to China and the peace of mankind, but it seems to me that a great nation of intelligence and power owes to a weak and trustful people like the Filipinos the duty of respecting our engagement with them in the same sense in which they understood it. There is no danger either to the peace of the world or the prestige of our Republic in taking this course. It has been said upon this floor that if we did this Germany, France, Russia, or England would seize these islands. But the truth is that this difficulty is entirely unreal.

It would be easy for us to treat the Philippine Islands as we treat Liberia. That Republic is not on the Western Hemisphere. We do not claim that it falls under the influence of the Monroe doctrine. It is located on the coast of Africa, where Germany, England, and France are pushing forward for new territory.

We never have undertaken to exercise the slightest sovereignty over it. Yet we have had occasion to define a policy in regard to it. I read from Wharton's Digest of International Law, section 66, from a letter dated April 21, 1880, written by Mr. Evarts, while Secretary of State, to Mr. Hoppin:

"The United States are not averse to having the great powers know that they publicly recognize the peculiar relations between them and Liberia, and that they are prepared to take every proper step to maintain them. To this end it is not inexpedient that you, and Mr. Lowell also, on his return to his post from his present leave, should evince a lively interest in the movements of both Great Britain and France in the neighborhood of Liberia."

While Wharton does not publish the entire letter, I find, on examining the files of the State Department, a further expression in the same letter which may be usefully quoted here:

"The attitude of the European powers which may have established themselves in the vicinity of Liberia becomes of interest to the United States whenever it may assume a tendency to disparage the asserted rights of native self-control."

In 1884 a letter was written on the same general subject by Mr. Frelinghuysen, Secretary of State, to Mr. Roustan, the French minister. Wharton quotes a part of that letter also, as follows:

"Liberia, although not a colony of the United States—"

We claimed no jurisdiction over it whatever—

"began its independent career as an offshoot of this country, which bears to it a quasi-parental relationship, which authorizes the United States to interpose its good offices in any contest between Liberia and a foreign state, and a refusal to give the United States an opportunity to be heard for this purpose would make 'an unfavorable impression in the minds of the Government and the people of the United States.'"

In the same letter it is said:

"It seems, however, proper that I should in the name of this Government advise you provisionally that the United States would consider a French claim to territory in the Mannah River as threatening the integrity and tranquillity of Liberia. I should, however, be most happy to learn that the report of French occupation of Kents Island is unfounded."

On another occasion, in 1880, Mr. Evarts, while Secretary of State, wrote a letter to Mr. Noyes, in which he called attention to the information which had been received here that the French Government had designs of establishing a protectorate over the Liberian Republic.

Mr. Noyes, the American minister to France, wrote back that on making inquiry he had discovered that there was no intention of the part of the French Government to institute a protectorate over Liberia. That letter was published in the volume of "Foreign Relation of the United States" for 1879, and Mr. Noyes, having ascertained in advance that it would be published, suggested that it was necessary to put the correspondence in print. But our Government declined to heed his suggestion, and it was said:

"It is therefore quite suitable that the great powers should know that the United States publicly recognizes those relations which we

bear to Liberia, and is prepared to take every proper step to maintain them."

Our entire interest in Liberia has been put on the ground that it was settled by Africans who left this country, and a hint from us has never failed to arrest all designs cherished by European nations against this little Republic.

Now, if we go into the Philippine Islands and give those people their just inheritance of independence, our Government can say rightfully to the world that the people of the Philippine Islands established their independence by aid of our arms; they sustained us in the war against Spain, and we shall therefore always regard them as objects of our parental care. Not one of the powers of Europe would dare to make the slightest aggression upon the independent government of the Philippines at the hazard of our displeasure.

I wish to say in conclusion that the idea that we must either take the treaty as it is or subject ourselves to tremendous consequences of difficulty with Spain is another unreal conception in connection with this situation. Spain has no money, no navy, no hopes; and whenever the United States says, "You must make the same relinquishment in regard to the Philippine Islands that you have made in regard to Cuba," she will instantly yield to our pleasure and close up a war which has advertised alike her folly and weakness. But Senators say we can attend to all these questions after we have ratified the treaty.

He is but a poor student of human nature who depends too much upon his own firmness of purpose in dealing with great and constant questions in a great and constant way. The people of the United States never have given up a foot of territory. The smallest acquisition becomes a matter of pride after it once be-

comes a part of the Republic. When two or five years from now it is proposed to give up the Philippines the Senator from Colorado, or some other Senator, will rise to say that if we give them up Germany will take them, or England will take them, or Russia will take them, and we will always have this scarecrow of foreign interference in the affairs of the Philippine Islands to deter us from acting in the way our better judgment might suggest.

Let us make no pretexts. Let us not trample upon the aspirations of the Philippine people to imitate the character of this Republic.

I am one of those who believe in a Providence which cares for the destiny of collective millions. I feel that our toilers have outstripped all others and grown greater in a century than nations that have lived a thousand years, not alone because we have more energy and more brain than those who dwell in other lands, but because we have been the justest nation of all history. In this great crisis let us show to all hearts and all time that the American Republic still furnishes the world's best example of righteous rulers and a free people.

STATES.	POPULAR AND ELECTORAL VOTE OF 1892.								
	CLEVELAND, DEM.		HARRISON, REP.		WEAVER, PEO.		BIDWELL, PRO.		SCAT- TERING
	Popular.	Elec- toral.	Popular.	Elec- toral.	Popular.	Elec- toral.	Popular.	Elec- toral.	Popu- lar.
Alabama	138,138	11	9,197	85,181	239	603
Arkansas	87,834	8	46,974	11,831	130	53
California.....	118,174	8	118,027	1	25,311	8,096
Colorado	38,620	53,584	4	1,687
Connecticut	82,395	6	77,032	809	4,026	323
Delaware	18,581	3	18,072	564	13
Florida	30,143	4	4,843	570	100
Georgia	129,386	13	48,305	42,937	988	774
Idaho	8,799	10,520	3	283	2
Illinois	426,281	24	399,288	22,207	25,870
Indiana	262,740	15	255,615	22,208	13,050
Iowa	196,367	219,795	13	20,595	6,402
Kansas	157,237	162,845	10	4,538
Kentucky	175,461	13	135,441	23,500	6,442
Louisiana	87,922	8	13,331	13,332
Maine	48,024	62,878	6	2,045	3,062	336
Maryland	113,866	8	92,736	796	5,877	27
Massachusetts	176,858	202,915	15	3,348	7,539	676
Michigan	202,296	5	222,708	9	19,792	20,569
Minnesota	100,919	122,823	9	29,279	14,182
Mississippi	40,288	9	1,395	10,102	995
Missouri	268,188	17	226,918	41,102	4,318
Montana	17,581	18,851	3	7,334	519
Nebraska	24,943	87,218	8	83,134	4,902
Nevada	714	2,811	7,264	3	89
New Hampshire..	42,081	45,658	4	293	1,297
New Jersey	171,066	10	156,101	969	8,133	1,337
New York	654,908	36	609,459	16,430	38,193	17,958
North Carolina ..	133,098	11	100,565	44,732	2,630
North Dakota	1	17,519	1	17,667	1	897
Ohio	404,115	1	405,187	22	14,852	26,012
Oregon	14,245	35,002	3	26,875	1	2,281
Pennsylvania	452,264	516,011	32	8,714	25,123	898
Rhode Island	24,336	26,975	4	228	1,654
South Carolina ..	54,698	9	13,384	2,410
South Dakota	9,081	34,888	4	26,544
Tennessee	136,477	12	99,973	23,622	4,856
Texas	239,148	15	77,475	99,638	2,165	*3,938
Vermont	16,325	37,992	4	43	1,424
Virginia	163,977	12	113,256	12,275	2,798	591
Washington	29,844	36,457	4	19,105	2,553
West Virginia	84,467	6	80,293	4,166	2,145	8
Wisconsin	177,456	12	170,698	9,852	13,232
Wyoming	8,454	3	7,722	530	29
Totals	5,554,685	277	5,172,333	145	1,040,600	22	270,314	27,653

The candidates for Vice-President and their electoral votes were: Adlai E. Stevenson, Democratic, 277; Whitelaw Reid, Republican, 145; James G. Field, People's 22; James B. Cranfill, Prohibition, 0.

Simon Wing, Socialist candidate for President, and C. H. Matchett, for Vice-President, received 17,656 votes in New York, 649 in Massachusetts, 1,337 in New Jersey, 893 in Pennsylvania, 336 in Maine, 329 in Connecticut, and 27 in Maryland.

* Cast for White Republican electors, known as the Little White ticket.

STATES.	POPULAR AND ELECTORAL VOTE OF 1896.								
	MCKINLEY, REP.		BRYAN, DEM., PEOP., N. S.		PALMER, NAT. DEM.		LEVEERING, PRO.		SCAT- TERING.
	Popular.	Elec- toral.	Popular.	Elec- toral.	Popular.	Elec- toral.	Popular.	Elec- toral.	Popular.
Alabama.....	54,737	131,226	11	6,462	2,147
Arkansas.....	37,512	110,103	8	889	893
California.....	146,688	8	144,766	1	2,006	2,573	2,652
Colorado.....	26,271	161,063	4	1,717	545
Connecticut.....	110,285	6	56,740	4,234	1,808	1,223
Delaware.....	16,804	3	13,424	877	355
Florida.....	11,288	32,736	4	1,778	654
Georgia.....	60,091	94,232	13	2,708	5,543
Idaho.....	6,324	23,192	3	197
Illinois.....	607,130	24	465,613	6,390	9,796	1,940
Indiana.....	323,754	15	305,753	2,145	3,056	2,507
Iowa.....	289,293	13	223,741	4,516	3,192	805
Kansas.....	159,345	172,854	10	1,200	1,611	620
Kentucky.....	218,171	12	217,890	1	5,019	4,781
Louisiana.....	22,037	77,175	8	1,834
Maine.....	80,465	6	34,688	1,879	1,570
Maryland.....	136,959	8	104,735	2,507	5,918	723
Massachusetts.....	278,976	15	105,711	11,749	2,998	2,114
Michigan.....	293,582	14	236,714	6,879	5,025	1,995
Minnesota.....	193,501	9	139,626	3,230	4,365	915
Mississippi.....	5,130	63,880	9	1,071	485
Missouri.....	304,940	363,667	17	2,355	2,196	888
Montana.....	10,494	42,537	3	186
Nebraska.....	103,064	115,999	8	2,885	1,243	980
Nevada.....	1,938	8,377	3
New Hampshire.....	57,444	4	21,650	3,520	779	277
New Jersey.....	221,367	10	133,675	6,373	5,614	3,985
New York.....	819,838	36	551,396	18,950	16,052	17,667
North Carolina.....	155,222	174,488	11	675	247
North Dakota.....	26,335	3	20,686	358
Ohio.....	525,991	23	477,497	1,857	5,068	2,716
Oregon.....	48,779	4	46,662	977	919
Pennsylvania.....	728,300	32	433,228	11,000	19,274	2,553
Rhode Island.....	36,437	4	14,459	1,166	1,160	558
South Carolina.....	9,281	58,798	9	828
South Dakota.....	41,042	41,225	4	683
Tennessee.....	148,773	168,176	12	1,951	3,098
Texas.....	167,520	370,434	15	5,046	1,786
Utah.....	13,491	64,607	3	21
Vermont.....	51,127	4	10,637	1,331	733
Virginia.....	135,368	154,709	12	2,129	2,350	108
Washington.....	39,153	51,646	4	1,668	968	148
West Virginia.....	105,368	6	94,480	675	1,216
Wisconsin.....	268,135	12	165,523	4,584	7,509	346
Wyoming.....	10,072	10,655	3	136
Totals.....	7,107,822	271	6,511,073	176	133,800	130,683	47,405

In the above table the Bryan-Sewall and Bryan-Watson tickets have been combined. The total number of votes received by the Bryan and Watson ticket was 222,207. Of this number Alabama gave 24,089; California, 21, 23; Colorado, 2,389; Florida, 2,053; Illinois, 1,090; Kansas, 46,194; Maine, 2,487; Massachusetts, 15,181; Mississippi, 7,517; Nevada, 575; New Hampshire, 379; Ohio, 2,615; Pennsylvania, 11,174; Tennessee, 4,525; Texas, 73,572; Vermont, 458; Wyoming, 286. Fusion electors were agreed upon by the Democratic, People's, and Silver parties in the following States: Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.



REPUBLICAN	
DEMOCRAT	
POPULIST	
DIVIDED	