W. J. BRYAN ON THE ISSUES

LARGE AUDIENCE HEARS DEMOCRATIC LEADER.

He Holds to 16 to 1 as a Primary Article of the Democratic Faith—Insists Filipinos Be Given Independence —Opposes Trusts.

DES MOINES, August 17.—At the auditorium last night Mr. Bryan spoke as follows:

"I am grateful to Father Nugent for the kindly words with which he has presented me to this audience. I am glad of the religious character of the audience, which is manifested by the fact that some of our Methodist brethren say 'amen' to his sentiments. (Cheers and laughter.) When you get down deep enough for bed rock principles, you can bring all the churches and all the denominations together in accord with a sentiment that makes all men kin. And in this great conflict, we are reaching bed rock. I esteem it a great privilege to speak to this great audience; to see the people thus manifest their interest in principles that were declared dead in 1896. I want to bring encouragement to you. There is no more doubt of our ultimate triumph than of tomorrow's sunrise. I believe this because I believe in the intelligence and the patriotism of the American people, and in the omnipotence of truth. (Applause.) If we are right, we will win. When it went against us in 1896, I believed we were right and would yet triumph; and if we were wrong, it was best that we should have failed. I believe that the good citizen desires the triumph of that which is true, rather than of that which he believes to be true. No republican can more earnestly rejoice in my defeat than I will do, if he will prove to me that my defeat was for the good of the country. I say it selfishly, for I am going to live here for some time yet. (Laughter.) For the benefit of some republican newspapers that have been given to announcing that I was dead, I desire to say that unless I get away from my present plans, I will be here some years to come. The good of the country should be the good of the whole country, and of the whole plain people, not of the men who hold the postoffices and the positions.

"If we are right, we will succeed. And events are vindicating the position of our party in 1896. More than that: I believe that every plank in the Chicago platform was right (applause); I believe that every plank in that platform is now right; and I believe every plank will be right in 1900. (Great applause.) That platform did not deal with temporary questions. It applied the principles laid down by Thomas Jefferson to the problems before the country. The republican party, since its victory, has not solved one of them. (Applause.) No, not one. Its conduct has only brought into bolder light the iniquity that characterizes every dealing of that party.

"The Dollar Above the Man."

"I will take as my text the statement that the republican party is putting the dollar above the man. This is the very antithesis of the republicanism of Abraham Lincoln. Why, in 1856, when it was first organized, the founders of the republican party appealed to the people to take the government back to the principles of Washington and Jefferson! Today, you would think from its policies that Alexander Hamilton was the patron saint of the republican party. But when it was organized, it appealed to Jefferson and to Washington. In 1859 the republicans of Boston were celebrating the birthday of Jefferson. Think of republicans celebrating the birthday of Jefferson! Abraham Lincoln was invited to be present, and in expressing his regrets he paid to Jefferson as high an encomium as I can pass upon him; and to be Jefferson is to be the greatest statesman the world has produced. Mr. Lincoln said that the republican party believed in the man and the dollar; in case of conflict, it believed in the dollar before the man. As president, he called attention to what he feared as the approach of returning monarchy, in the attempt to place capital on an equal footing with or above labor. If I were to say that today, what would they call me? Demagogue would be the mildest term. Yet Lincoln said it, and if he was alarmed then, what would be his alarm today if he could see capital enthroned and labor debased by every policy of the republican party? A bad principle will manifest itself till the majority will see it. This one has manifested itself in various ways. But it will continue to do so till all must see it. And we have learned a good deal since 1896.

The Income Tax.

"Our platform declared for an income tax. I believe in it now; I believed in it then. When one judge, by changing his mind, rendered unconstitutional a law similar to one that a few years before had been sustained by the full court, I believed it right. And believe it right now, until such time as the constitution can be so amended that not one judge, or nine judges, can build a bulwark about the fortunes of the rich. (Applause.) I used to quote Justice Brown of Michigan—I am so cautious, that when I am going to say anything particularly strong, I like to quote somebody else as saying it; and when am quoting I like to quote republicans—and he said: 'I fear that in some hour of national peril this decision will rise to paralyze the strong arm of the government.' Yet there were those who did not see it. The hour of national peril came; the time when war was upon the nation. We could not use the income tax, like Great Britain, for our Anglomaniacs have borrowed everything that was bad from England, but left all that was good. We could not employ the income tax, as England does, to make the rich pay for the national defense out of their abundance. The republican party demands a great standing army, a great navy, an imperial policy, but it cannot tax the rich to provide them. It becomes necessary to look about us to see what we can put a stamp on! I find the things every day on which we can put them. If I want to send a telegram, I pay the same price for the message that I always did, and then I pay a tax of one cent toward the benevolent assimilation of the Filipino. (Laughter and applause.) The law was so drawn that it might be construed to allow the telegraph company to shift the burden of that tax to the back of the man who sent the telegram. Why? Because the telegraph company had more influence with the republican party than all the men who vote its ticket. We all see it now.

"I remember in 1896 after we had adopted our platform and opened our campaign, that some of our friends said it would drive away from us the rich democrats. I did not believe it, and undertook to defend the rich democrat. I said they did not want what was not right, and would not desert the party because it proposed to do justice. I didn't know the rich democrats then as I do now. 'But,' I said, 'even if we do drive away the rich democrats, the poor republicans will flock in to take their places; it will be just the same in the end.' But I didn't know the poor republican then so well as I do now. (Applause.) It was like the Irishman who was driving a mule to his cart. The mule stopped and began to kick. 'All right,' said the Irishman, 'if you want to get in and ride, you're welcome, but when you get in, I'll get out.' The republican party was bad enough before it got our worst democrats; since then it has had several millstones hanged about its neck.

"But the people see what it is to have a government, limited in its powers to deal with the dollar, but unlimited in its powers to deal with the man. Our government can resort to the draft to call men into its armies, but it cannot tax the wealth of the millionaire to support them. In the hour of national peril, it can take the father, however much the family may need him; it can call the son, the husband, and send them to face the guns of an enemy; but it cannot lay the weight of one finger on accumulated wealth, to compel it to bear its share of the burden. (Cheers.) And why? Because the republican party has put the dollar above the man; because it holds money more sacred than blood.

"There is another question, too. Possibly I ought to apologize to this audience for bringing in a funeral subject But I must dwell a little time on a dead issue—the money question. (Laughter.) Did you ever see anything that had so many lives as the money question? In 1892 they said it was dead. But in 1893 the president had to call congress together to bury it. Again they buried it in 1894, and once more in 1895. And you may remember that it was up again in 1896—and had to be buried again. (Laughter.) Then they said that did settle it. I read the headlines myself. But again it was up in 1897, and in 1898—it is here now, and they are burying it again. But I have examined the corpse, and find it in such a good state of preservation that I believe it will last till 1900.

Righteous Cause Will Not Down.

"Why is it? Why is it that they find it so hard to bury the silver cause? Because no tomb was ever made so strong that it could imprison a righteous cause. Why is it that our opponents continue to bury the silver cause? Because they would rather go to a funeral than a debating society. (Laughter.) You tell me that this question has been eliminated from politics. Who says this? It requires all my patience and Christian forbearance to keep me from getting mad when I talk to a goldbug. I do not mean to use the term 'goldbug' in a contemptuous or critical sense. I only use it as a brief descriptive term—with all the kindliness of feeling that he uses when he calls me a scoundrel, a lunatic or anything of that kind.' I console myself with this thought, that if he calls me a name and I deserve it, I have no right to complain because he has found me out; but if he calls me a name and I do not deserve it, I can call him another. What provokes me is that when you talk to a goldbug, he doesn't reason with you. He simply smiles down upon you with a look of contempt. I don't like to have a man look down upon me. His strongest argument is an expression of contempt. The argument is somewhat like this. The goldbug says: 'Why, are you a silver man?' The silver man looks small and says 'Yes.' Then the goldbug says, 'What, a man of your intelligence?' The silver man nods his head, and then the goldbug smiles contemptuously. That ends the argument. It is too awful to think about, and the goldbug will not think about it; it is too awful to talk about, and the goldbug will not talk about it. If any man is entitled to look down with contempt upon another man, it is the bimetallist upon the goldbug. For eighty-one years we had the double standard, from 1792 to 1873, and no party ever declared against it. Is that not a record?

Former Bimetallism.

"Some people say we never had a double standard or bimetallism. If a man says this, all we can say is 'give us what we had, and call it what you please.' Give us the law that Andrew Jackson framed, the free coinage of gold and silver at the mint at the ratio of 16 to 1 without waiting for the aid or consent of any nation. Give us this, and apply to it what name you will. We not only have had the double standard, but we have had the gold standard, and this without asking for it. It came upon us like a thief in the night. When I was young, I remember at the debating societies, we used to debate the question whether there was not more pleasure in anticipation than in possession. I have always regretted that we were not given the pleasure of anticipating the gold standard. The gold standard concealed its blessings, and we had it for twenty-three years before anybody found out about it, and before any party dared to defend it. After nineteen years, all three parties asked for bimetallism, and the republican party, which claims all the intelligence and all the patriotism, met at Minneapolis. McKinley was the chairman of the committee on resolutions, and a platform was adopted, saying that the American people, from traditions and interest, favored bimetallism. Now as to 1896. We had a campaign then, which even a man of my years can distinctly remember. Taree parties denounced the gold standard as un-American, and threatened to send it back to England whence it came. Six million votes were polled, and not one of them was bought or intimidated. More votes were polled than were ever polled for any other platform. But you say that the republicans polled more votes. Yes, according to the returns. We did not know where they all came from. It was no doubt thought twice as right to vote for honest money as for dishonest money. What did the 7,000,000 people vote for? For the republican ticket, for the republican platform, which promised to see what could be done toward getting other nations to help us to get rid of the gold standard.

"What has happened since the election? President McKinley sent a commission of three learned men to Europe to ask the European nations to help us to get rid of the gold standard. I am willing to give him credit for all that he did. He had to admit that the gold standard was a bad thing, and that we ought to help him to get rid of it. The republican congress voted $100,000 to pay the expenses of this commission, and we ought to give the republican congress credit for their willingness to spend the peoples money to get rid of the gold standard. The commission went to Europe, and France joined with us in an effort to get rid of the gold standard. The English laboring men petitioned the English government to get rid of the gold standard. Why did they do this? Because the gold standard had been a curse to the English laboring men, and they knew it. An agriculturist commission reported, signed by two-thirds of the commission, that the gold standard had been the chief cause of the agricultural depression in England. Farmers, how can you believe that the gold standard is good for you in the United States, when the English farmers decreed it bad for them in England, which is the home of the gold standard? You tell me that England did not join with us to get rid of the gold standard. That Europe did not join. Why? Because in September, 1897, some bankers met, few in numbers, and with closed doors, and pledged themselves to secrecy, and adopted resolutions declaring that the gold standard was all right. Those bankers controlled the English government, and the English government controlled Europe and Europe, through the English government, controlled the policy of the United States. You tell me that the gold standard is good. No party ever won an election on it. You tell me that the money question is dead. No handful of English bankers can ever settle a question for the American people. (Applause.) They say we can't use the same arguments now as in 1896. There is a difference between a goldbug and a silver man. In Ohio, in 1897, when I went there to make a speech, they said: 'There comes Mr. Bryan singing the same song as in 1896.' The silver man could sing the same song over and over again, and the more he sings it, the more the people like it.

Never Repeats Song.

"The goldbug never sings the same song twice. They said in 1896: 'What you need is confidence.' They can't play the confidence game upon us any more. Four days before the election the papers said that in four days confidence would be restored; the day before election they said, 'Tomorrow confidence will be restored.' The day after election they said, 'Confidence is restored.' More banks failed the first six months after the election than ever in the history of the country. If I had been elected, it would all have been laid to my door. More business houses failed the first six months after the election than ever in the same period of time before. If I had been elected, all this would have been my fault. Times got so bad that some people thought that I had been elected, and one man from Texas wrote and congratulated me. But I have not been drawing a salary, nor have I been appointing new cabinet officers to fill the places of those who have resigned. Times got better, and then the goldbug came out and said: 'See! Didn't I tell you what would happen if the gold ticket was elected? Didn't I tell you that gold would be discovered in British Columbia?' And didn't every man who discovered gold in the Klondike admit that he had been mistaken? The people who said in 1896 that we had enough gold were the ones to do the most rejoicing when more was discovered. If the quantitative theory of money is wrong, what difference does it make if we have more? You admit that the quantitative theory is correct when you rejoice over the gold discoveries in the Klondike, and the importation of gold from Europe. If increase of gold makes better times, why not open our mints and get more of it, and of our own money? Money, like food, must be considered both as to its quality and its quantity. What's the use of telling me about the splendid quality of your food if you haven't any for me when I am hungry? Prosperity comes from the people. The republicans says that prices are rising. There are several ways to make rising prices. One way is to form a trust and to raise the price of something that the farmer will buy, without raising the price of what he must sell, so that he is obliged to burn the candle at both ends. If the gold standard is good, it must be because rising dollars are good; and if falling dollars are good, it must be because falling prices are good. No goldbug can discuss the question for an hour without contradicting himself. In 1896 he said that what the laborer wanted was falling prices; now he tells the farmer that prices are rising, and forgets to tell the laborer that he cannot buy as much for his money. To hear a goldbug argue, you appreciate the story of the man traveling in the mountain path that was so crooked that he met himself coming back. The goldbug contradicts himself so much that he is continually meeting himself.

W. J. BRYAN.

"The gold standard can have but two results. First, it proposes to make gold the only standard of value. That means that while the debt is increasing the volume of money is decreasing. It means that every man who has a debt to pay must hunt around for the gold to pay it with; it means increasing competition for gold and that he must sacrifice more and more of that which he produces in order to get the gold with which to meet his obligations. Secondly, it means that it is confining the basis of our circulation to gold, which is so scarce that when the financier wills it he may draw away the supply and create a panic if he so wills.

"Do we want this kind of a basis for our circulation? No, we want a basis so broad that no one will be cramped, a basis so broad that financiers cannot create a panic at will. We advocate bi-metallism because we want the standard so broad that it cannot be manipulated.

"But we are not alone in this desire. The president and congress not only tried to get it when they sought to secure an international agreement, but in November, 1898, Secretary Hay wrote to Lord Aldingham, a director of the Bank of England, in which he said that the president and a majority of congress still believed in international bi-metallism and its desirability. But the republican party in the state of Iowa has repudiated the national platform of the republican party and has written and adopted a platform as strong for gold as though it had been written by a foreign financier. It is a platform that means the retirement of the greenbacks and the issuance of only such paper as shall be redeemable by the government in gold and of credit paper by our banks.

"In its last national campaign the republican party did not declare for the retirement of the greenback, for the president in his message said that it was the purpose to keep every portion of the circulation as good as gold, and that silver certificates and greenbacks should be maintained at par. But even at this time a bill is pending in congress by which it is proposed to retire the greenbacks. For this purpose 2½ per cent gold bonds are to be issued by the government, these bonds to be the basis of a national bank circulation. That means that when the farmer or the laborer buys a government bond he must lay it away and be satisfied with it, but that the national bank may invest its capital in the bonds, deposit them with the treasury department, get the interest on the bond and also have the use of the money that it may issue on the bonds up to their par value. Why is this? Why, because the national bank is organized wealth and has more influence with the republican party than the farmer.

"But I must beg your pardon for talking so long on this question, when there are others for discussion. Now, there is the trust question. I don't know whether all of you have heard of it or not, but I do know that here in Iowa the republican party hasn't made up its mind on that question, as evidenced by its platform declaration. It proposes to investigate the trusts and to do away with them if they are a bad thing. Now I don't know exactly how they are going to discern between the good trusts and the bad trusts, but I take it that the good trusts will be the ones that contribute the largest amounts to the republican campaign funds.

Parent Trust of All.

"But why not start at the root. The money trust is the parent trust and the greatest trust of them all. What is the use of fighting the toothpick trust or the nail trust or the rubber trust or the soap trust, one against which the great unwashed democracy would probably have the least antipathy, when we have the money trust to commence on. It is the greatest and the worst trust of them all—and more harmful than all the others combined. Some people call on me to stop fighting the money trust, but I want to say to them that we can't stop fighting the old bear for a chance to hunt a cub once in a while.

"I want to warn you that whenever you start in to fight the industrial trusts you will find the same foe back of them, the same financiers who are back of the money trust and who fought us on the silver issue. I don't want you to take my word for it, but take the words of the financiers themselves. Recently I read an interview in the Chicago Times-Herald with John J. Mitchell, president of the Illinois Trust and Savings bank, in which he declared that trusts do not harm, that they do good if properly managed. This interview was accompanied by an editorial, in which it was declared that there are good and bad trusts, but I want to tell you that as soon as the people learn to discern between good and bad trusts and go after the bad trusts the demagogues will try to divert their attention to some other question that their brains do not comprehend and that they cannot understand.

"Recently Mr. C. R. Flint, president of the rubber trust, in a speech at a banquet in Boston, declared that trusts are beneficial and gave as a reason that when there was a strike at one mill another mill could be opened to supply the trade until the striking operatives had been frozen out. Mr. Flint is right from his standpoint. After the men have been frozen out at one point the trust can then close down a mill at another point, while it is still doing business, and freeze the working men there. This report said that Mr. Flint had a sympathetic audience and concluded with the statement that it consisted entirely of Boston bankers. They are the same forces we found behind the money trust and they are behind the industrial trusts and will be.

"A trust means that every man who buys an article must buy it at the trust's prices, that every man who sells an article must sell it at the trust's prices and that every man who works must work at the trust's prices. I am surprised to see that the people are only now commencing to understand the trusts. I am also pleased that the traveling men have commenced to understand them and must admit that I am disappointed because they did not understand them in 1896. They could not see then that the trust question applied to the money question as well as to the industrial question, but they see it now. Why, at this time not more than one man in 100 sympathize with the trust, and yet the republican party does not declare against them. Why? Because the one man furnishes the money. You say you want to extinguish the trusts, but I want to tell you that you want to take the extinguisher out of the hands of the trusts first.

Destroy Money Trust.

"First of all, you must destroy the money trust. The attorney general says the power to deal with trusts must be found in the states. I say that the state cannot deal with the trust, because it cannot fight it beyond its own borders. The national government is the only force that can reach into all the states and pluck the evil wherever it may be found. It can reach into every state and annihilate the companies that are parties to the trusts. But we already have a statue against trusts, and although it is mild I insist that it is the duty of the attorney general to enforce it. A man who steals a horse, no matter how scrawny and poor it may be, may be sentenced to the penitentiary for ten years for offending against only the owner of the horse, but the man who organizes a trust and who wrongs 70,000,000 people can be sent to the penitentiary for only one year. Let a man steal a horse valued at $100 and no power on earth can keep him out of the penitentiary, but let a man steal $1,000,000 and no power on earth can put him in the penitentiary.

"But you say, suppose the attorney general does enforce the law. Let him recommend a law that is sufficient. Maybe the supreme court will hold it unconstitutional. Then let him recommend a law to congress that will empower that body adequately to deal with trusts. Why does the attorney general not do this? Because, in the days of his youth, he remembers his creator. The federal government, and it alone, can deal with trusts. It is possible for it to do it. It is possible because every trust is built upon a corporation, and every corporation is a creature of law. When God created men, he did not make one man very much larger than another, nor very much stronger than another. We looked at His work and said it was good, but we would make a fictitious one that was better. When God made man, He made a limit to his life, so that if he was bad, he need not be bad always. We raised the limit in the corporation. When we created the corporation, we did not give it a soul, so that if it escaped punishment in this world, it would not need to suffer hereafter. The corporation made by human hands should not need to suffer hereafter. The corporation made by human hands should not have rights not given to man that God created. We can destroy trusts when we want to. Are the people ready? If not, we can wait until they have a harder time. That is one beauty about living in this country—you can have what you want. If a man enjoys having his nose to a grindstone, he can keep it there and keep the wheel turning. You have heard of the man on top of another fellow, who told the other fellow to holler when he had enough. When the people have had enough of the trusts, they can holler, and I can promise you that you will be pounded so that you will soon cry 'enough.'

"There are two questions, imperialism and an army. Shall we have a large army? In 1896 an army of 25,000 was enough. In 1898 the president asked for 100,000. The demand was made while the nations of Europe were asking for a reduction of the armaments. The demand was made at Christmas time, when the people were preparing to celebrate the doctrine of 'peace on earth, good will to men.' Need I tell you the difference between the republic and an empire? Twenty-five thousand soldiers were enough for a republic of 70,000,000 of people; 100,000 soldiers are needed for an empire of 10,000,000 more. Who will pay the extra expense of maintaining this army? An addition of 75,000 soldiers means an extra expense of $100,000,000 a year. Who will pay for this increase? The Filipinos? To do this, they would have to be taxed for seven times as much as Spain taxed them. If we pay for it, who will it be of us? It will be the people who will pay the taxes—the people who furnish their sons to die in the jungles. Who will get the benefit? The syndicates. Not long ago a man arrived in San Francisco from Hong Kong. He gave out in an interview that it was the duty of this country, a duty owed to the world and the Filipinos themselves, to hold the islands. That man had come home to organize a syndicate to develop the islands. A few days later he gave out another interview, in which he said he was organizing a syndicate to furnish the islands with electric lights, with street cars, with gas, with banks, etc. When I read what this one man's syndicate was going to do, I made up my mind that one syndicate would be enough, that all we needed to do was to furnish the army to hold the islands while he developed them.

Meaning of Expansion.

"What does expansion mean? It means the exploitation of a new country. If this people wants to sell their birthright for a mess of pottage, let them at least investigate the quality of the pottage. How much will it cost this country to hold 10,000,000 people, speaking thirty different languages, and living in 1,200 different islands? Who can tell? How much will we get back? I think we can whip the Filipinos into subjection—all of them who do not die in the process. We cannot tell how long it will take, or how often we will have to repeat the subjugation, or how much it will cost, but I am enough of an American to think we can beat any nation on earth—that we ought to beat. Little Spain had almost completed the job of whipping the Filipinos, after having been at it only 300 years. She sold to us a quit claim deed—or rather an option on the fighting. (Laughter). It is not a question of whether we can whip the Filipinos or not, but whether we ought to whip them. I do not like to bring this question down to dollars and cents, but will it pay? It will not pay the right people. I can understand how men wanting offices in the army desire to hold the islands; I can understand how people wanting franchises in the islands can advocate holding them. But I cannot understand how the great people can want to hold them. You say hold them as a place for our children to go. Twenty people to the square mile here, and sixty people to the square mile in the Philippines—or that many when we commenced—and then talk about securing an outlet for our surplus population. Our people would not go there and live under the tropical sun for all the wealth of the islands. Why?

"Why? Because they would rather live in Iowa or Nebraska. If you think that they would, look how it has been with other nations. In Jamaica there are 14,000 whites to 600,000 natives. In Java there are 25,000,000 natives to 60,000 Europeans. Look at England in her Indian possessions. From what you hear, you would think that the English people had been going over there in droves. I was amazed to find that after fifty years of English domination in India there are only 100,000 English born, and it takes an army of 70,000 English and 100,000 natives to protect these 100,000 English people. You may think that England is educating the natives. Less than 1 per cent of the native women can read and write, and less than 5 per cent of the total population can read and write. You may think that England is Christianizing the natives. Less than 1 per cent of 300,000,000 people, after 150 years of English gunpowder gospel, are Christians.

"If you want to find out how the natives feel about the English domination, do not ask the younger sons of Great Britain. Ask the natives themselves. I read the other day a statement of a native who said that their condition was worse than that of the American slaves, because the masters of the slaves in America had an interest in keeping them alive. But the British officers in India have no interest in keeping the people alive. Senator Wolcott, returning from that country, said that the famine in India was not a food famine, but because the English government, at the behest of the British bankers, had changed the financial system of that country.

"Let us dwell for a minute on the religious aspect of the question. Nothing has surprised me more than the people who defend conquest of an alien people on Christian grounds. I read the bible and defy you to find a single passage in the new dispensation justifying conquest. The bible gives us the Christian religion: I deny that you can give the religion of Christ by hypodermic injections. Why not admit that the greater part of the people with whom we are fighting are Christians? The Tagalos are Christians. Those most friendly to us are Mohammedans. Why not, before we secure an Anglo-Saxon alliance, get a Christian-Mohammedan alliance, and arm the Mohammedan portion of our subjects to fight our Christian subjects? I do not doubt that the imperialists are Christians. They simply mix their quotations. I am reminded of the man who mixed his parables, and quoted something like this: 'A man was journeying from Jerusalem to Jericho, and he fell among thorns, and the thorns sprang up and choked him.' The memory of the imperialist is defective. They get mixed on their beatitudes. They say, 'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall inherit the earth;' whereas, it reads: 'Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth;' and 'Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the sons of God.' Secretary Gage gave the secret away.

"He said, 'Philanthropy and 5 per cent walked hand in hand. Philanthropy falls by the way, and 5 per cent picks its pocket. Philanthropy gets weary, and 5 per cent goes on, and never feels lonesome.' The impulse to steal land, we are told, is the current of manifest destiny flowing in the hearts of the people. I denounce the republican party, which imprisons petty thievery and enthrones grand larceny, which says: 'Thou shalt not steal—on a small scale.'"

"My friends, this is a serious question. I read a sermon preached not long ago by Rev. Mr. Brown in Rochester, N. Y., in which he took for his text what Pilate said when Christ appeared before him. You will recall the words of the scripture when he said: 'Knowest thou not I have power to release thee or put thee to death.' He went on to say that thus force and love were brought face to face there in Pilate's chamber. Pilate had behind him the great Caesar and the Roman legions, while Christ stood there alone. From this picture the preacher went on to describe how from the time of Pilate the power of the Romans had waned until it had finally passed from the face of the earth, but how peace and love, as exemplified by Christ, had increased in power until now his name is daily on the lips of millions. Continuing, he said that again today in the United States peace and power are once more face to face and that the question now is whether we shall go forward through peace and by persuasion, or resort to dynamite and gunpowder and force. I believe that the time will come when the people will rise up in their might and say that we are to go forth, not by force, but in peace; that we have come to the Filipinos, not to bind them, but to make them free.

Americans Encouraged Aguinaldo.

"But there is another side to this Philippine question. Who was it that hunted Aguinaldo up in China? It was the American consul. What ship was it that took him to Manila and put him ashore near that city? It was an American ship. Who was it that wanted him brought back to Manila? It was Admiral Dewey, the greatest hero of our Spanish war, who asked that he should be returned to his people and assist us in driving the Spanish power out of the islands. It was an American general who supplied him with arms and ammunition and it was the Filipino who hemmed the Spanish in by land while we held them in check at sea and forced them to surrender. And when this was done, what did we do? Why, we slipped around to their back door and bought a quit claim deed from Spain to the titles of our allies at $2 per head. But when we insist that was not fair treatment, and that we should take some other policy toward the Filipino, they tell us it is either too soon or too late, or that they cannot tell now whether the time has come or not, while others say that we cannot deal with them until they lay down their arms. But I say that we could have done it when we made the treaty with Spain. Some argue that we could not make Spain grant independence to the Filipino, but it looks to me as though if we could take a quit claim deed, we could have given one. If our treaty had recognized the independence of the Filipinos not one drop of blood would have been shed at Manila. If we had given them assurance, as we did the Cubans, that they were to be independent, there would have been no blood shedding. But in answer to this it is argued that the president has not the power to do these things and that congress is not in session. But congress was in session for three months before the treaty of peace was ratified and congress can be called together by the president. But when we talk of calling congress together they say that it would cost too much. I do not believe it would cost as much as it is costing us to carry on this war. The president called congress together to repeal the Sherman law and he called it together to enact tariff legislation and he can call it together to dispose of the Filipino question. Let him call congress together now to enact legislation to the effect that the declaration of independence is still a law of the land and that it is still in force.

Kinds of Government.

"There are two kinds of government in this world, one a government by consent and the other a government by force. The republic is a government by consent and a monarchy a government by force. The two will not mix; we must have the one or the other. Which do we prefer? We cannot establish an institution by force in the Philippines and maintain that which we would not countenance on our own soil. Our declaration of independence says that a government gets its right to govern from the consent of the people. Is that true, or is it a lie? If it is true, then let the Philippines go. If it is not true, then let us repeal the declaration of independence and no longer lie to the world. If I find a pocketbook in the road with the owner's name printed on the outside, I do not have to open it up and count the money before I make up my mind whether it would be right to return it or not, and it is so with the Philippine question. We do not have to stop to reckon what there is to be obtained in holding the Philippines before we decide what should be done with them. We know now what it would be right to do with them. We ought to say to them that we can go to war to break the shackles of the oppressed, but not to forge them. We ought to say to them 'Stand up and go free.' We not only should say to them 'Go free,' but we should promise them the protection we have given to Cuba and to the Central and South American republics. We should tell them that we have come in peace to establish a government in the place of the one we have destroyed, a government that when it is established is to be theirs and after we have turned it over we should say to all the world, 'Hands off.'

Advance Without Bloodshed.

"In 100 years without resorting to the Gatling gun or the sword we have done more to advance the cause of civilization than all the nations of the world. We have done more for the common cause of man and for history and we would not exchange that history for that of any other country in the world. In this way we have grown from a little nation to a great one. And now shall we turn back and throw down our traditions. Shall we say that our Liberty Bell rang in vain. You remember how when the Declaration was expected the people gathered in the streets, expecting to hear the signal bell, and how, when finally the last signature was affixed and the bell rang out, they caught up the signal and cheered and cheered. Since that time that bell has been taken from state to state and people have revered it and tears have come to their eyes at sight of it when they realized what it meant to them. Now are we to say that the Declaration of Independence for which it rang was a lie and that the real declaration is a thing thirteen inches long and round in shape, that is fired out of a gun. The imperialists may say so, but the common people will not, and we will not give to the crowned heads of the monarchs an opportunity to kill the fatted calf in celebration of the return to the ranks of the empires of the world of the great republic.

The Conclusion.

"What are we to do? Because of the friendship of France in our war of revolution, the people joined and placed in New York harbor a statue of Liberty enlightening the world. What shall we do with it? Shall we take it down, and send it back to France and say we are not in the business any more? Shall we go to England and get a statue of William the Conqueror and put it in the place of Liberty? I propose a plan which is more American. Give the Filipinos their liberty! Place in Manila harbor a new statue of Liberty enlightening the Filipinos. That is the American plan. But I am told we must have an Anglo-Saxon civilization. I am as much an Anglo-Saxon as the average American—I have Scotch and Irish and English blood in my veins—but I am all American! I have not a word to say against the races that are famous in history. They have been great—the Latin and the Greek, the Slav and the Celt, the Teuton and the Anglo-Saxon, but greater and higher than them all is the American in which is blended the virtues of all the races.

The American civilization ought to be above and beyond any civilization the world has ever known. In 1896, some preachers found fault with my platform. One said it was made in hell, and another said it was written by the devil. The latter statement I found rather personal, for I had written a part of the platform myself. But on this question, I want a platform to be written higher than any other the country has known. I want it to proclaim that we should not teach a man how to take care of himself, but how to make him love his neighbor as himself. The Anglo-Saxon civilization has attempted the former; the American civilization will inspire in another race the desire for self-government. The American civilization will plant its flag in the hearts of the people, not over their heads. I beg you to study this question.

"By resisting temptation we can do more than by waging many wars. Study the question and you will find that the republican party has been putting the dollar above the man—taxation, trusts, everything, and is doing it now. Yet when we say a word against annexation and forcible conquest we are told that we are pleading the cause of the Filipinos. I say that we are pleading the cause of 70,000,000 American people. Abraham Lincoln said that if we destroyed the spirit of liberty in man we planted the seeds of distrust and of war. By denying self-government to the Filipinos we are endangering self-government in the United States. We cannot plant in the orient a principle of government we are not willing to plant on American soil. No nation will ever be great enough to trample with impunity on the rights of the humblest people in all the world."

Almost 6,000 years were necessary to produce the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

Chinese Law.

According to the Chinese method of criminal prosecution a man is responsible for the crime he may have committed personally, but if he chooses to escape justice by running away from the place where the deed was committed then the remaining members of his immediate family are held and punished in lieu of the real culprit. This may seem a strange way of attracting the real criminal back to the scene of his crime, but it has proved quite successful, because it appeals to the religious side of the man's superstitious nature. According to their religion the man who forsakes his parents when in peril will find his soul sailing around through hades without chart or compass for all eternity. In view of this, compliance with the law is very prompt, for John Chinaman does not care to take the desperate chance.