THE DAILY GLOBE

IS PUBLISHED EVERY DAY
AT NEWSPAPER ROW,
COR. FOURTH AND MINNESOTA STS.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

Payable in Advance.

Daily and Sunday, Per Month .50
Daily and Sunday, Six Months $2.75
Daily and Sunday, One Year - $5.00

Daily Only, Per Month ----- .40
Daily Only, Six Months ----- $2.25
Daily Only, One Year ------ $4.00

Sunday Only, One Year ----- $1.50

Weekly, One Year -------- $1.00

Address all communications and make all remittances payable to
THE GLOBE CO., St. Paul, Minn.
Complete files of the Globe always kept on hand for reference.

TODAY'S WEATHER.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 12.—Forecast for Thursday: Minnesota—Partly cloudy weather; warmer in northwest portion; variable winds, becoming southerly.

Wisconsin—Generally fair; colder in southern and southwest portions; brisk northerly winds, becoming variable and diminishing.

North Dakota—Fair, probably followed by light snow; warmer in southeast portion; southerly winds.

South Dakota—Partly cloudy weather; southerly winds.

Iowa—Fair, preceded by snow in the southeast portion; northerly winds.

Montana—Generally fair; southwesterly winds.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

United States Department of Agriculture, Weather Bureau, Washington, Jan. 12, 6:48 p. m. Local Time, 8 p. m. 75th Meridian Time.—Observations taken at the same moment of time at all stations.

TEMPERATURES.

Place.	Tem	Place.	Tem
St. Paul	24	Qu'Appelle	18
Duluth	22	Minnedosa	12
Huron	20	Winnipeg	6
Bismarck	12		
Williston	26	Buffalo	56-56
Havre	26	Boston	48-52
Helena	28	Cheyenne	24-28
Edmonton	18	Chicago	38-55
Battleford	18	Cincinnati	66-68
Prince Albert	18	New Orleans	60-76
Calgary	18	New York	40-46
Medicine Hat	20	Pittsburg	66-66
Swift Current	18		

DAILY MEANS.

Barometer, 29.84; mean temperature, 27; relative humidity, 78; wind at 8 p. m., north; weather, cloudy; maximum temperature, 29; minimum temperature, 25; daily range, 4; amount of precipitation (rain or melted snow) in last twenty-four hours, 0.

P. F. LYONS, Observer.

FOR SMALLER CONVENTIONS.

The Brooklyn Eagle, which is one of the ablest and most thoughtful exponents of true Democracy in the country, has raised the question whether national conventions might not be made much smaller than at present with gain to party and to the public. Taking for its text the burning of the Coliseum at Chicago, which was built for the meeting of the last national Democratic convention, it asks whether such enormous structures are necessary for the future to accommodate the delegates of the people; and whether the great crowds that now attend the nomination of presidential candidates as delectable shows do not tend to lower the tone of politics. These crowds, says the Eagle truly and expressively, are "the terror of statesmen, the burden of managers, the hotbed of cranks, the harvest of demagogues and the opportunity of corruptionists. The idea that only by bigness and enthusiasm can representative results be assured is error. National committees are hindered by the folly consequent on the unruliness of these big bodies—hindered before and after they meet." Starting from this premise, the Eagle recommends that both parties should adopt a rule limiting the representation from each state in national conventions to the same number as it has senators and representatives in congress, instead of doubling the number as now. This would reduce the size of national conventions one-half, and by just so much would add to the dignity and importance of the delegates. It would cut in two the unwieldy conventions that now assemble, and assist an orderly and expeditious transaction of their proceedings.

What the Eagle says is true, but it is scarcely more than half the entire truth. The great trouble with national conventions is not the size of their membership, but the habit of indiscriminate admission granted to the followers of the leading candidates. This assembly of packed galleries, to raise pandemonium whenever the names of particular candidates are named, this attempt to win by yelling and infernal din, this idea of sweeping delegates off their feet and out of their senses by placing them in the center of a howling mob of madmen, is a graver evil than the size of the convention itself. We could very well afford to have a convention of 900 delegates or more, but the difficulty and the disgrace come in when there are from 10,000 to 15,000 spectators admitted. If this practice is to be continued, it matters little whether the delegates are a few more or a few less. They are lost sight of in the vast whirl of the mob that surrounds them, led in partly by curiosity and partly by self-interest, frequently hired by the managers of various candidates to create a semblance of enthusiasm, and always a hindrance and menace to sound reason and the sober transaction of the people's business.

The first point of attack in the way of reform, it seems to us, is the admission of spectators by ticket, as at present, to the full limits of the auditorium provided. The national convention should choose for their place of meeting some hall which would just acommodate their delegates and the members of the press. All others should be excluded. If national conventions are to become once more deliberative bodies—bodies having judgment and a will of their own, met to determine upon the best policy and the best men to lead their parties before the people—they will have to put a stop to the present practice of turning themselves into a national circus and attempting to bring about or defeat nomintaions by the mere power of noise.

We agree entirely with the Eagle's idea as to the size of conventions. A delegation equal to the state's representation in congress would be amply sufficient, although such a change will probably be difficult to bring about. This is not because the advantage of it will not be appreciated, but because of the singular hunger that there is for the empty honor of becoming a delegate to a national convention. There are so many men in each state with whom such an appointment answers instead of a more honorable and lucrative job, and whom the politicians are delighted to placate and reward by attaching to the lapels of their coats the delegate's badge, that a reduction in the number of these places will meet with strong opposition. It seems to us, however, that the main thing is to secure the exclusion of the claque from national conventions, and then attack afterward the far simpler and less threatening question of the size of the various state delegations.

A JUST AWARD.

No verdict ever rendered by a jury in St. Paul was received with heartier approbation and satisfaction than that which mulcts Lieut. Bahe in the sum of $3,250 for false arrest. This award of damages was made on behalf of the men whose detention without cause, whose insults and whose stripes appealed in vain to the police force and to its official head a few months ago. The Globe rejoices that the individuals who were so grievously outraged have followed up their legal remedy, and it hopes that no device may be valid to save the property of the offending officer from this just claim upon it. If Lieut. Bahe is beyond the reach of public opinion, or of any other influence that would cause him to moderate his policy as a member of the police force, this verdict will at least stand as a warning to him and to others that unoffending citizens cannot be arrested and clubbed in St. Paul with entire impunity. We return the thanks of the whole community to this jury for its excellent work, which could not have been improved unless it had gone, in its estimate of damages, to the full limit asked for.

Incidentally, we may observe, that this is a very fair measure of the judgment passed upon this administration by the citizens of St. Paul. It was by no means Lieut. Bahe alone who was on trial in this case. He was the only one against whom legal proceedings would lie, but it is his official superior, Mayor Doran, as the supreme head of the police force, against whom the righteous indignation and severe censure of the public is directed. This is the case in which Mr. Doran refused to interfere. These are the circumstances that were laid before him by the injured parties, fully corroborated by a committee of reputable citizens, and his reply was that he could do nothing. What he did do was to retain Lieut. Bahe on the police force after this transaction was thoroughly ventilated, and thereby he placed upon his course the stamp of official approval. In reality it was Mayor Doran as well as Lieut. Bahe who was on trial in the court on Tuesday; and, insensible as he appears to be to the censure of good citizens, and open only to be moved by the applause of bad citizens, he can hardly fail to appreciate the force of the fact that, on the merits of the case, a jury was unanimously against him.

There was no division of opinion as to the fact that damages were due to the plaintiff, and the only question which the jury had to decide was as to the amount. We do not believe that twelve men could be found in St. Paul, outside of office holders or political henchmen of the mayor, who would have rendered, upon the evidence, any other verdict than that which has been returned. This is what our people think, because they are decent, law-observing and liberty-loving people, of the present administration. It is an opinion that may possibly penetrate the pachydermatous mayor and give him a bad quarter of an hour when he comes to consider what it means for his future.

A SICK REVENUE FUND.

The statement of the state treasurer for December bears out the prediction of the Globe, made when the November statement showed that fund overdrawn $54,000, that the deficiency was bound to increase. December shows overdraft of $185,461. By March the bulk of the railway tax will have been paid in. In 1896 that source yielded $1,090,510. It is estimated that it will yield $1,100,000 for the fiscal year ending next July. If payments have been made proportionately to those of prior years one-fourth of this has been paid, leaving a possible $850,000 or $900,000 to come. Deducting the overdraft leaves about $700,000. To this there is to be added the state tax of 1.5 mills, levied for 1898, which on the valuation of $583,000,000 will produce $874,500. Of this valuation $478,472,654 was on real estate, the levy on which will produce $717,708. But the amendment to the law providing that payment of half this tax may be deferred from June to November will cut this revenue for 1898 in half, leaving some $350,000, without allowance for delinquencies.

We have then for the remaining seven months an income of about $1,000,000 to meet what remains of unpaid appropriations made in 1897 for the fiscal year 1898, amounting to $2,023,795. The November and December statements, with their respective deficits of $54,000 and $185,000, indicate very clearly that all convertible balances from '97, if any, and all income received from 1898 have been used up; and the recent action of the state board of trustees of insane hospitals, convened to see where expenses could be cut, indicates that neither income already realized nor that anticipated will be sufficient to prevent this deficit from growing larger until the year ends. Allowing the income from gross earnings to reach even $1,250,000, and adding to the $350,000 coming in from the half of the real estate tax the $150,000 from the tax on personalty, we have a total of $1,750,000 to meet appropriations aggregating $2,023,795, leaving a probable deficit July 31 of at least $274,000.

The reason for this is not difficult to find. It lies in the heedless, reckless profligacy of the legislature of 1897. It surpassed that of 1895 in extravagance, that body having exceeded the income with its appropriations and left a heritage of $164,074 of deficit for the year 1896 to its successor. It must be understood that each legislature makes appropriations and levies taxes for the two fiscal years following that in which it meets. The session of 1895 provided for the years 1896-97, that of 1897 for 1898-99. When the session of 1897 met it should have found revenues sufficient to carry the treasury through to July 31, 1897. Instead of that, either because of excessive appropriations by the legislature of 1895 or of its own prodigality, that legislature added to the expenditures of 1897 by making immediately available appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $626,743.23. Of this the general bill carried $352,174.15, including the deficiency of $164,074.15, and sundry bills carried the remainder of $274,569.08. In addition to this the revenues of the year 1898 were mortgaged to pay $76,520, and those of 1899, $76,600 to pay sundry bills of 1897.

On the adjournment of the legislature there was a general chorus of praise for its economy. It had levied a tax of but 1.5 mills, and its general bill carried but $843,000 for 1898. The trick in this is found in the standing appropriations, those which run from year to year and do not appear in the biennial bills. They find their parallel in the continuous appropriations of congress. The standing appropriations amount yearly to $1,103,770. The tendency to increase these standing appropriations appeared in the addition to them of $55,800 by the last legislature. Here is where we find the sufficient cause of the sickness that now afflicts the revenue fund and for which there is no present cure. That is only to be found in a deficiency appropriation by the next legislature and a permanent remedy in the more careful selection of legislators this fall, men who have some conception of the trust given them, the source of revenue, and who do not believe that reckless and indiscriminate squandering of public money is statesmanship.

SHORT BUT BRIGHT

Continued from First Page.

the gold standard; it was favored by the idle holders of idle money.

To understand a man's opinon of the money quesion, it was necessary to understand his interest. He had often heard of, but had never yet met those reputedly self-sacrificing individuals who could subordinate their own private interests to the good of the people at large. With cutting satire Mr. Bryan ridiculed J. Pierpont Morgan in this connection. Mr. Bryan scored the Indianapolis monetary conference for insisting on the maintenance of the single gold standard after it had been repudiated by 99 per cent of the American voters.

"Until we have an independent financial policy, we are but the province of that nation which cracks the whip over us," he continued.

Mr. Bryan referred to the recent decision of the Minnesota supreme court in the Steenerson rate case, and said it seemed to him reasonable and fair—the application of common sense to a common carrier.

Returning to the gold standard and its supporters, after this brief digression, he said:

"Tell them that we shall do by day what they did by night; that we shall undo by law what they did by law."

Loud calls for "Donnelly" at the close of Mr. Bryan's speech were responded to briefly by the Nininger middle-of-the-roader. He said he did not come to make a speech, but to enjoy one, and after hearing it, he wanted to say that he had heard all the great orators of the English tongue on both sides of the Atlantic—Gladstone, Parnell, Balfour and all of them—and when compared with Mr. Bryan, they were like the old-fashioned single-barreled fowling piece with a gatling gun. There was only one orator whose voice charmed him more, and that was the voice of a lady. (Uproarious applause.) Not the single lady who is to become a double lady, but a married lady, Mrs. W. J. Bryan. If he will withdraw, we will all get to work and nominate her and elect her. "There is some hesitation in certain quarters," said Mr. Donnelly, "about the proposition that all bimetallists should unite to support Mr. Bryan, but it is not because people are not ready to follow the Democratic party. I am reminded of the man who read the epitaph on a tombstone:

" 'When this you see
Prepare for death and follow me.'
"Underneath it he then inscribed:
" 'To follow you were not content,
Until we know which way you went.'

"The Democratic party reminds me of Milton's picture of sin at the gates of hell. Western bimetallists are fearful lest the Western lion from Nebraska will be gobbled up by the Tammany tiger of the East. It would be a work of supererogation for me to endeavor to add to the eloquent argument that has preceded me."

Mr. Donnelly then briefly denounced the conspiracy of the money power, and it was nearly 11 o'clock when the big meeting finally broke up.

DR. PINE'S INTRODUCTORY

Pays an Eloquent Tribute to the Bimetallic Champion.

Dr. Pine, in introducing Mr. Bryan, spoke as follows:

During the great civil war which resulted in the overthrow of negro slavery, which had existed prior to the birth of the republic, and which was upheld by a majority of the pulpits and secular papers of the country, I shouldered my musket at the call of President Lincoln for three hundred thousand more. I enlisted for three years, or during the war, and, with other atoms of that great army, endured the hardships and privations of real war, and the prison pen. But together, without faltering in the struggle for liberty and justice, we marched and fought and waited patiently for the dawn of peace, which came at last. And so when the gigantic struggle of 1896 was thrust upon the American people like a thunderbolt from a clear sky; when the once great Republican party in convention assembled at St. Louis had parted from its moorings; when the last vestige of Lincoln Republicanism had been tampered with by that body; when the golden calf set up by the organized money lenders of Europe had been adopted as a party symbol, then it was that we, hundreds of thousands of life-long Republicans, deserted that rotten Hannaized corruption—that corruption-stained old ship of the Republican party. It was then that tens of thousands of battle-scarred warriors who had fought the battles of liberty more than thirty years ago and had received their miserable pittance in greenbacks, which were then worth but 40 cents, enlisted again to aid a gigantic and incessant battle against the plutocratic anarchists of this country. Of the six and one-half million voters who formed our grand army, no deserters could be found, and the trend of events that indicate that Cleveland's panics and McKinley's prosperity are as like as straight lines of equal length, justify the prophecy that two millions more will be added to our cause within the next year. I deem it one of the greatest pleasures of my life, as an ostracised Lincoln Republican, to announce to you, my neighbors and friends, the brilliant champion of the toiling industrial classes of this country, the Lincoln of today, our beloved William J. Bryan, of the United States. (Great and prolonged cheers.)

MR. BRYAN'S ADDRESS.

Brilliant Exposition of the Theory of the Silverites.

Mr. Bryan then said:

I want to occupy such time as it may be proper to detain you in the discussion of a question which must be confessed to be of great importance, no matter from what standpoint you look at it. The subject of bimetallism is a subject which the American people have been considering to a greater or less extent for some twenty-four years, and I desire, if possible, to make the subject so plain and so well understood that those of you who believe in bimetallism will be able to present your arguments with force and effect to your neighbors; and those of you who do not believe in bimetallism, will be able to know why you do not accept our doctrine. There is much ignorance upon this subject, or, to use a less offensive term, much lack of knowledge. A man may be learned in some things, and yet know nothing about other things. A man of far less general information may know much more about a subject which he has studied than another man much better informed may know about it if he has not studied it. Sometimes you find financiers who seem to imagine that a man engaged in the handling of money must necessarily understand the money question, and that a man who has not much money to handle must necessarily be ignorant in regard to the money question. A man was once making a speech and made some remark upon the subject of money, and a farmer undertook to correct it, and he said to the man: "What do you know about this subject? You have not handled $1,000 in ten years." A man may study the subject to find out why it is that he has not more chance to handle money, and a man may handle so much that he has no concern or reason to investigate the subject at all. In order to understand or to argue, we must have some point on which we can begin. We must commence at some proposition which all accept, and I want to commence at the foundation and build up in the discussions of this question, and my first proposition is that all men are created equal. If that proposition is not true, in the sense in which it is used, in our government, then my foundation is false. If all men are not entitled to equal rights before the law and all stand with respect to government on the same level, then I confess the foundation of my argument is erroneous. If there is a person here who disputes that all are created equal and should stand equal before the law, then I cannot expect him to agree to bimetallism, because bimetallism is built upon that solid foundation. More than that, if there is a person in this audience who does not believe in the doctrine of equality before the law, then I say that person, whatever he may call himself, to whatever party he belongs, has no business to live in a country where the government is based upon the principle of equality before the law. Now, if all men are created equal, then no citizen has a natural right to injure any other citizen. That follows as a necessary consequence.

IF ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL,

then how can you assert that any one person has a natural right to injure any other person, and if any citizen has a natural right to injure any other citizen, then no good government will either enable or permit one citizen to injure another. Now I think you will have to agree with me thus far, because no one can destroy this proposition without admitting that he is out of harmony with the government under which he lives. If, then, it is the duty of a government to protect each citizen in the enjoyment of life and liberty, and in the pursuit of happiness, then you cannot defend any law which has for its object the giving of one citizen an advantage over another citizen. The great questions of government are not difficult questions when they are analyzed and the principles which underlie them understood. "Thou shalt not steal" is recognized as a commandment, both sanctioned in morals and enforced by law. If I tell you that no man has a right to go out on the highways and take property of another man, why, you say everybody will accept that. I make it broader, that it is no more right to rob by law than to rob by force, either in day or night. And I propose to show you that the gold standard is a larceny by law, and that those who love it most love it best because it is easier to steal that way than to steal in the old-fashioned way. (Applause.) Don't misunderstand me. I don't mean to say that every man who believes in the gold standard believes in it because he wants to do wrong. But I shall show you, and I think I can bring proof that will convince you, that those who believe in the gold standard intelligently, knowing what it means, and what it does, believe in it because they prefer to have the commandment which I have given to you violated. Now, taking as our fundamental proposition that government should not enact laws for the benefit of a

FEW AGAINST THE MANY,

or for the benefit of one against some one else, let us see if we can apply this doctrine to the subject of money. What is an honest dollar? Now you hear a great deal about an honest dollar, but you don't get any definition of it, or a definition of it from those who talk about it most. Ask one of the advocates of a gold standard what he regards as an honest dollar, he will look wise, and he tells you that by an honest dollar he means sound money. And you then ask him what he means by sound money. He then looks a little wiser, if it is possible for him to look wiser, and says it means an honest dollar. It is hard to get him out of the circle, but if you get him to define it, he will say that an honest dollar or sound money is money that when melted loses none of its value. The "melting pot test," that is what you call it, the "melting pot test." That is his test for determining whether money is sound or a dollar is honest.

I want to show you that that definition is not correct. It leaves out of consideration the greatest and most important thing in a dollar. Purchasing power is immaterial to it. Supposing that all the nations in the world should get together and decide upon the gold standard and agree upon our dollar as a unit. They then decided that we had too much money, and got together 99 per cent of the money and sunk it in the ocean, what would be the result? We would still have an honest dollar. Suppose also that instead of contracting the currency you expand it; suppose you had agreed upon the dollar as the unit of standard and somebody would find a way to make one hundred times as much, what would be the result? Why, if you melted it you would not lose anything, but it would be honest according to the definition given by the advocate of the gold standard. The definition given by the gold-bug omits the most important thing in a dollar—purchasing power. The definition given does not include purchasing power; therefore, whether the dollar buys much or little, it is an honest dollar, providing you can melt it without loss. He seems to be ignorant of the fact that that characteristic is a law-given characteristic. Why can you melt a gold dollar without a loss? Because you can coin it without charge. If you charge five cents for converting a piece of gold bullion into gold coin, and you melt it up, you lose five cents. They seem not to understand that gold can be melted without loss simply because the law says that you can coin it into money without charge. I heard of a debate which brings out this idea. We had two men discussing the question, and the gold bug said the gold was the only good money. To back his statement he asked that you put one thousand dollars in gold in your house, one thousand dollars of silver and one thousand dollars in paper in your house. Your house then burns down, the gold would be melted, the silver would be melted and the paper would be burned. The silver would be worth but one-half its former value, the gold would not lose its value at all, while the paper would be gone entirely. Therefore, he said, gold would be the best money. The other fellow then took for an illustration one thousand dollars in gold, one thousand in silver and a like amount in paper currency, on board a ship, and the ship would sink. The gold would go to the bottom, the silver would go to the bottom, but the paper would float, therefore the paper would be the best money. There is just as good sense in that argument. The law says, in substance, if a man puts gold and silver in his house, and his house burns, and the gold and silver is melted, he can take the gold and have it recoined, without loss, and the silver you will have to take to some shop and turn it into spoons. If you had a law under which we could take silver to the mint and have it coined at a certain price, would you sell it to any one for half price? Of course not. Go out among your neighbors, buy all they have to sell for just half what it can be sold for in the market. Then turn around and sell it for full price. There is a good profit in it.

THERE IS MILLIONS IN IT.

So, my friends, I come to my definition. It is not an original definition. The definition which I give you of an honest dollar is a definition which can be found in the work of every reputable writer of political economy who ever wrote on public money since 1873. You cannot find in the old writers of political economy any difference upon this subject. What would be an honest dollar? A dollar whose purchasing power, not its purchasing power today when applied to one article, but the dollar whose average purchasing power is the same yesterday, today and forever. That would be an honest dollar, and that is the only kind of honest dollar that there ever was, is or could be. If a dollar rises in purchasing power, the man who owns money and contracts payable in dollars, profits by the rise. If it falls in purchasing power, then that man loses and the man who owes money makes the profit. Why is it that as an honest dollar is defined today by those who believe in the gold standard, that it is made to describe a dollar which rises in value. It is because the definitions have been made by those who profited by rising dollars. We have rising dollars today. We condemn the gold standard because it gives us a rising dollar, a dollar of increasing purchasing power. I tell you that a rising dollar is a dishonest dollar. I place myself upon a foundation that no man dare assail. (Cheers.) Last summer, a year ago, we who were standing upon the Chicago platform were accused by our opponents of not having proper respect for the courts. We deny that anything we had said or done showed a lack of respect for the courts, but those who were advocating the gold standard tried to make it seem that we were not respecting the courts as much as we ought. I find that there has been decided in this state by the supreme court a case known as Johnson against St. Paul City Railway company. Mr. Bryan read a short extract from the decision and, continuing, said: Now let no anarchist rise up to dispute what your court has said about a rising dollar. If you read the decision that the court not only declared that the

DOLLARS HAVE RISEN

in purchasing power, but had declared that unless the plaintiff would reduce the verdict to $4,000 from $4,500, the judgment would be reversed. Here is an argument made in the supreme court decision of your own state, and I believe the decision was a unanimous one. In determining whether a judgment was too large or not, it ought to be taken into account that dollars buy more now than they used to buy. I hope that hereafter no gold-bug will array himself against the highest court of the state of Minnesota. If the dollars have risen in their purchasing power, and that fact is worthy of being considered, whether judgment was too large, then my friend is it not worth while to find out why the dollar has risen in value? Is it not worth while to find out why? Who was it that made that dollar? It has been done by law, therefore injustice has been done by law. The increase in the purchasing power of the dollar has made a man pay more than he agreed to pay, and has enabled the man who held the note to collect more than he had a right to collect. I want to ask you what in morals is the difference between allowing a man to take or to have in the first instance what he is entitled to, and then going to him ank taking a part of what he has saved and making a law that raises the purchasing part of a dollar that he must pay, and enables you to collect the same number of dollars, but dollars of greater purchasing power to his harm and detriment. If you went and took his property by force you would be called a thief! But if you make a law to take it by law you are a financier. (Applause.)

Now, bimetallism is not a recent invention. Bimetallism is not an experiment. Bimetallism is an old established principle. It has existed for thousands of years, and if any of you who advocate bimetallism have been frowned down as men who were trying to bring some new order of things, let me give you a few propositions to submit to your opponent. Bimetallism is the old thing, and gold standard is the experiment. We had bimetallism for eigthy-one years in the United States. From 1792 to 1873, and yet in all that time there never was a political party of any name that ever condemned it in national convention. Do you know of any other policy that lasted that long without some party denouncing it? You cannot say that the people did not know of the gold standard because for fifty years England had the gold standard, and we had the double standard, and no great man from Washington to Lincoln preferred the gold standard while we had the double standard. We adopted the gold standard without any party asking for it. Do you believe that our government changed from one to the other without knowing it. The change was made without the American people knowing it. We abandoned bimetallism and substituted the gold standard without the American people knowing that it was being done. Not only did congress do this without the knowledge of the people, but congress did it without the members of congress knowing what was being done.

Now you say that is not possible. Well, it was done, and I think I can show you that it is not impossible, even as a matter of reason. We were not using at that time either gold or silver. We were using paper. The bill was to codify the mint law. The members of congress stated that they did not know when the bill passed, that the bill demonetized silver. Blaine, who was then speaker of the house, said he didn't know it. Others said they did not know it. If anybody tells you that it is impossible to get a bill through congress without the members of congress knowing what the bill contained, you ask him who put section 22 in the Dingley bill. Members of all parties examined it, read it and talked about it, and yet it passed the house and the senate and was signed by the president, and then they asked

WHO PUT SECTION 22

in that bill? My friends, that is not the strangest thing. Not only was the change made without the public asking it, or without their knowing it, or without congress knowing it, but for twenty-three years experiment under the gold standard was so disastrous that no party of any name dared to approve of demonetization in any platform, or dared to say that the gold standard was a blessing to the American people.

Sometimes you find advocates of the gold standard who were shocked that any man could believe in free coinage. And yet the man who defends the gold standard is defending a thing that, after twenty-three yers of experience, could only muster 132,000 voters in the United States who liked it. Only one party in the history of this nation ever declared in a national convention for a gold standard, and that was the party known as the National Democratic party. It polled 132,000 votes. Many of them by mistake. (Applause.)

Take the political history of this country, and what do you find? You find that in 1896, after we had the gold standard for a little more than twenty-three years, the Democratic party declared against the gold standard and in favor of independent bimetallism, and stated how it wanted free and unlimited coinage of 16 to 1 without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation. You may oppose the doctrine if yo want to, but that one Democratic platform that could not be construed both ways in different parts of the country. As soon as the president was elected, he asked authority to send a commission to Europe. To keep the gold standard because it was a blessing? No! To get rid of it, because it was a curse. Why should we send a commission to Europe to get rid of a gold standard if it was a blessing? The man who advocates the gold standard has to do it in spite of all the history of the United States. I will go further. Possibly our people are not intelligent enough to know what is good for them. Possibly twenty-three years of experience are not sufficient to enable us to determine whether the gold standard is good or bad. If you insist that our people cannot be trusted in patriotism or in intelligence, I will get some evidence from across the ocean that ought to satisfy you. France has had the gold standard for twenty years. When our commission went to Europe, France at once joined and asked with ours for England to use bimetallism. Some people say the Germans are in favor of the gold standard. I have very often heard the gold people say that the Germans are so favorable to sound money. Yes, they are in favor of sound money. Let me call your attention to what has been done in Germany. In the spring of 1895, the popular branch of the German assembly passed a resolution declaring in favor of international bimetallism. Why did those people representing the masses of the German people declare in favor of international bimetallism if the gold standard had been a blessing, which they had for over twenty years. But the Berlin chamber of commerce immediately met and passed a resolution that the gold standard was all right. What does it mean? It means that in Germany it is the same as it is here. The masses cry out for bimetallism, but the financial man wants the gold standard.

Our commission went to England, and what did it find there? It found a sentiment in favor of bimetallism. It found that the labor organizations were sending petitions to the English parliament asking it to make concessions to bimetallism. The commission found that the agriculturists were petitioning the government to make concessions to bimetallism. Within a year a report has been filed and read in this country largely by this time, a report signed by ten out of fourteen members of an agricultural commission, appointed by a gold standard government to inquire into agriculture, and they reported international bimetallism as a relief to the farmers of England. If you want to know what the gold standard has done in Ireland; read that pamphlet by the venerable Archbishop Walsh, and see the harm done to the Irish people. There is a sentiment in favor of bimetallism in England, and that sentiment was so strong that our commissioners sent back word saying that they were hopeful something was going to be done.

My friends, there is a sentiment in favor of bimetallism. Not among the silver miners, but among the farmers, the laborers, the merchants, the people who have been producing the wealth. But you will tell me that England did not join with us. No. If you read the morning paper of Sept. 23 you found that on the day before there was a conference of the bankers of London at the clearing house in London, and you found that that conference passed by unanimous vote a protest against any concessions being made to bimetallism, and every man attending that meeting was pledged to secrecy. Those who were present, a mere handful of people, so small that they could be confined within the walls of a clearing house, protested against concessions being made to bimetallism and were heeded by their country; declared that the English government could not do what the commission asked. The gold standard has never been indorsed by the producers of wealth in any nation. It has never commended itself to the producers of wealth. The gold standard was conceived in avarice. It was fastened upon this country without the knowledge of the people, and, as many believe, by fraud. It has been continued for twenty-three years by deception, and never fought an open battle in any country in all the history of the world. (Applause.)

You may think the indictment severe, but I say it is true. The world does not want the gold standard and there are people who do want it, and I will tell you who they are, and why they want it. We have them in every country, and if you understand the fundamental principles which underlie these many questions, you are able to understand who wants the gold standard and why he wants it. In the first place, let me prove it by illustration. Many people imagine that the money question is a deep and intricate question, so complex that people cannot understand it. None of the great questions of government are intricate. They are so simple that the whole people can understand them if they will study them. Especially on this money question, you will find people who will say that, if they want a suit of clothes made, they will go to a tailor. If they want a pair of shoes made they go to a shoemaker, and if they want to know anything about money they go to a financier. Do you know a judge who is so just, so upright, so unbiased, that you would be willing to try a case before him if he was a party to a suit? And yet there are financiers who assume that the whole world ought to be willing to let them try a case in which they are parties on one side and humanity is the party on the other side. I want to make the principle so simple that no person can misunderstand it. I don't know what the papers may have said about me during the campaign here, but I want to say that I never boasted that I was a precocious child, and yet I will say that as I look back over my boyhood days, I cannot remember a time that I was so young that I did not have sense to know that when one end of a teeter board goes up the other goes down. (Laugter.)

The money question is that simple. When money goes up, property goes down. If rising dollars mean falling property, then cannot you understand that the man who owns dollars will be interested in having them rise, but that the person who owns property will be injured by having it fall. To illustrate: Suppose we could imagine ourselves walled in with just enough of wheat to last a year, and it was divided into two piles, one pile owned by one man and the other pile owned by another man. One pile would be burned. The supply would thereby be cut in half. Every bushel of wheat remaining would bring more money. We have two piles of money, gold and silver. Suppose you destroyed the silver pile and make gold alone the standard money of the world. Every dollar of money would rise in value. When money rises, a given amount of it buys more than it did before. The struggling masses are the ones who produce the wealth, and they are the ones who pay the taxes in time of peace, and in time of war the struggling masses are the only people who ever did show a willingness to sacrifice themselves for their country. The struggling masses who produce the wealth and pay the taxes of the country are, according to Carlisle, on the one side, and on the other are the idle holders of idle capital. Here are the three witnesses to point out the very division in society which I pointed out by logic and illustration. Am I wrong to call attention to that division? Is it worse for me to quote the language of Blaine than for him to have used it? Is it worse for me to quote the language of Sherman than for him to have used it? Is it worse for me to quote the language of Carlisle than for him to have used it?

I call your attention to the fact that in this country, at the very last election, 99 per cent of the people voted for bimetallism, either independent or international, and that less than one per cent voted for the gold standard. Within three months after the election, a convention was held in the city of Indianapolis, attended by men who called themselves financiers, and they adopted resolutions and what did they say. They said that the gold standard should be maintained. Ninety-nine per cent of the people voted for bimetallism and yet in spite of that, these men declared that the gold standard should be maintained. Well, they say that the great mass of the people cannot tell what is good, and must be taken care of by their financial friends. That is what happened in this country. I have called your attention to what happened in Germany, where the Berlin chamber of commerce arrayed itself against the popular masses of Germany. I know Germans, hundreds and thousands of them, who are not for the gold standard, and I point the Germans to the fatherland that there, as here, it is a contest between the money power and the common people, and they must be on the side of the common people in this country. In England the bankers protested against bimetallism. They did not equal the number of laboring men, farmers and manufacturers who petitioned the government. But they had more influence than those who were crying out against the gold standard, and now it is said that while 99 per cent of our people protested against the gold standard, only a year ago, that now we must have the gold standard whether we want it or not. In spite of the fact that 99 per cent of people registered a protest against the gold standard, notwithstanding the fact that the president sent a commission to Europe and still holds out the hope that the commission's work is not ended, the influence of the few is respected.

RENEWED RIOTING.

Newspaper Offices at Havana Attacked by Soldiers and Citizens.

HAVANA, Jan. 12.—At 10 o'clock this morning about 100 army officers, incensed by the violent attacks made by some of the local papers on the general-in-chief and the principal officers of the Spanish army in Cuba, went to the printing office of the daily journals, La Discussion and Ed Reconcentrado, and began smashing the windows and destroying the printing outfit, as well as cuffing the employes. A mob of thousands followed, shouting "Long live Spain, "Long live the army," "Long live the volunteers," The apeparance at the office of La Discussion of Gen. Garriche, acting military commander at Havana, and Gen. Solano, chief of staff, prevented more serious outrages. These officers then proceeded to the office of El Diario de la Marina, the mob shouting meanwhile "Death to El Reconcentrado" and "Death to La Discussion." But on the appearance of Gen. Parrado the people scattered. At 11:30 large crowds of citizens appeared opposite the office of El Diario de la Marina and began smashing the doors and shouting "Long live Spain," "Long live the army," "Long live the volunteers." The gendarmerie dispersed the rioters. Order was finally established. Central park has been transformed into a military camp. There has been great excitement among the authorities, who have taken all necessary precautions to maintain order. The troops have been ordered into barracks. Gen. Solano will deal most energetically with the initiators of the outbreaks. Tonight the police are guarding the printing offices.

At half past 8 o'clock this evening groups of civilians formed again in the Plaza de Armas in front of the palace shouting "Long live Spain," "Long live the king," "Long live Weyler," and "Down with autonomy." The cavalry came up, charged the groups and dispersed them. The regular infantry and cavalry now hold the avenues around the palace. In various parts of the city groups of civilians are shouting vivas and "Down with tutonomy."

CHICAGO, Jan. 12.—A special to the Times Herald from Key West, Fla., says: The second class battleship Maine, has received orders to hold herself in readiness to proceed to Cuba at an instant's notice. Notice came by telegram tonight. In compliance with these orders Capt. C. D. Sigsbee, commanding the battleship, has made all arrangements to get under way without delay. He has been placed in communication with Consul Gen. Lee, who will cable him whether or not it is necessary for him to go to Havana.

MADRID, Jan. 12.—Gen. Gonzalos Nunez the new captain general of Porto Rico died immediately after his arrival there.

GOMEZ TO BLANCO.

NEW YORK, Jan. 12.—T. Estrada Palma has received a copy of a letter written by Gen. Maximo Gomez, the rebel chief in Cuba, to Capt. Gen. Blanco. The letter says in part: "You have come to substitute Weyler. To a man of your conditions I would ask, as I did in the case of Gen. Campos: What are your aims and purposes? To exterminate us? It is impossible to do that, and to pretend such a thing might be little honor to you. Is your purpose to subdue us? That is absurd, and might prove a ridiculous attempt for you. Our determination is well known and patent. Neither extermination nor submission would mean peace. In view of this fact, I now repeat to you what I said to Campos: 'Let this bloodshed be stopped. Let the use of the torch cease, general.' Spain should not allow Cuba to owe her independence, directly or indirectly, to outside help. Let the deep abyss between Cubans and Spaniards disappear by Spain's recognition of the Cuban republic. Then there shall be eternal peace. Otherwise, there shall be blood and fire. That would be the command of our honor and dignity. We would follow it until victory, which always crowns those who fight for justice, settles out fate."

CONGER GOES TO CHINA.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 13.—An arrangement was today perfected by which Charles Page Bryan, of Illinois, nominated to be minister to China, and ex-Representative Conger, of Iowa, minister to Brazil, will exchange posts. There was considerable objection to Mr. Bryan's confirmation on the ground that he had no diplomatic experience and was not equipped for so important a post as that of minister to China is likely to be during the present administration, in view of the European scramble for possessions in China. Mr. Conger was minister to Brazil during the Harrison administration and was regarded as one of the strongest and best of our foreign representatives. The nominations making these changes were sent to the senate this afternoon. It is believed there will be no opposition to the confirmation to either gentleman.

BRYAN AND FUSION

WILLIAM JENNINGS AND IGNATIUS DONNELLY SPEND AN HOUR TOGETHER.

THEIR CONFERENCE SECRET.

THEY WERE BROUGHT TOGETHER BY SOME OF THE LOCAL POLITICIANS.

NEITHER WOULD TALK ABOUT IT.

May Mean Dakota County Man Was Asked to Keep Middle-of-the Roaders in Line.

Will Ignatius Donnelly call the middle-of-the-road Pops off to one side?

Or, if he would, can he?

Those are the questions that are interesting the local silverites, and the hope of a favorable response to the two questions was what actuated John L. Townley, the chairman of the county Democratic committee, to act yesterday as mediator between the forces of out and out Populism and the all-accepting liberal church of silverism, in securing a conference between William Jennings Bryan and Ignatius Donnelly, the former being urged to bring to bear upon the latter not only all his powers of persuasion in a general sense, but the personal influence of a long friendship.

The conference was had late yesterday afternoon, in fact, immediately at the close of the reception which the Nebraska man was given at the Ryan hotel for a couple of hours.

When the Nininger Populist arrived, he did not come up and grasp the hand of the Lincoln man as did others who came to visit at the silver shrine, but lingered in the main corridor, where his presence was observed by members of the local committee, who soon secured for the pair the seclusion of Parlor A.

The silverites want the middle-of-the-road Populists held in line. They want to elect a silverman in the state campaign of 1898 to as many state offices as may be within their grasp. They want a united opposition to confront the Clough-Van Sant Republican machine. To secure this, they thought that Mr. Bryan might swing Mr. Donnelly into line, succeeding in which, the leaderless party would fall of its own weight, or, at least, lose its fighting value. But if Mr. Bryan's mission was crowned with success, it was not admitted by either victor or vanquished when the conference of an hour was adjourned, both gentlemen insisting, in response to reporters' inquiries, that their confab had been of a personal nature, and being old friends, and that sort of thing, you know, it took a good while. Mr. Bryan, of course, was duly solicitous for the welfare of his old friend's intended, and Ignatius, of couse, was anxious to see how William was standing the wear and tear of continued public speaking and perennial campaigning.

But if Mr. Bryan persuaded Mr. Donnelly to turn back into the fold where there was the largest anti-Republican army, or in any way triumphed in securing from the Dakota county champion the concession of apathy in his leadership of the true blue People's party voters, it was not promised with that enthusiasm which gave assurance to the anxious local leaders that their cause was thriving under the beneficent influence of Mr. Bryan's visit as far as gaining outside acquisition was concerned.

Mr. Donnelly did not seem in the least perturbed over the implied threat contained in L. A. Rosing's speech at the banquet in Minneapolis Tuesday night, when he predicted that any self-constituted leader who got in the way of the united party would get hurt. He was ushered into the secret session with a seeming intrepidity that promised little hope for the success of persuasions to compromise.

And it is still a secret whether or not Mr. Bryan's subtle blandishments were subtle enough to convince Mr. Donnelly that the defeat of the Republicans in the state campaign this year, and, with the impetus given by the wiping out of that 50,000 McKinley plurality, the sweeping of the nation for Bryan in 1900, with the possible side bet of an honorable appointive place, would be sufficient recompense for but the abandonment of a cause repudiated by its own former friends, and with no shadow of a hope of victory.

GOES TO OMAHA TODAY.

Mr. Bryan Will Leave the City This Forenoon.

During yesterday afternoon's reception Charles W. Ames, who is an old friend of Mr. Bryan, extended to the Lincoln man an invitation to attend the meeting of the Informal club this evening, but it was declined with thanks, as Mr. Bryan is compelled to leave the city for Omaha this morning at 9:35.

TWO THOUSAND TELEGRAMS.

Congratulations Poured in on Hanna From All Sides.

COLUMBUS, O., Jan 12.—Senator Hanna has receved over 2,000 congratulatory telegrams. All the members of the national Republican committee and many state committeemen and other representative Republicans from all the states and various county chairmen are included, among them being the following:

Executive Mansion, Washington, Jan. 12.—Mrs. McKinley joins me in hearty congratulations. —William McKinley.

Washington, Jan. 12.—We are all rejoicing here over your grand success. Nobody happier than your old chum. —C. N. Bliss.

Washington, Jan. 12.—You will accept my sincere congratulations. —C. W. Fairbanks.

West Superior, Jan. 12.—Enough is as good as a feast. —W. R. Merriam.

Chicago, Jan. 12.—Everybody here rejoicing over your victory. Stocks one-half point higher. I congratulate you. —H. H. Kohlsaat.

Washington, Jan. 12.—I heartily congratulate you upon your election. —John Sherman.

Washington, Jan. 12.—The whole Alger family join me in congratulations. Now you are elected, I wish you would come to Washington and give some of the rest of them a chance in the newspapers. —R. A. Alger.

Washington, Jan. 12.—Nothing in politics have triumphed with you. Congratulations. —Joseph McKenna.

Washington, Jan. 12.—Bells are ringing, bands playing and the flag is where it was waved at the beginning of the fight. I congratulate the American people. —R. B. Hawley.

Washington, Jan. 12.—Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace and good will among Republicans. —W. E. Mason.

Inquiry was made about midnight for a telegram from Senator Foraker, and the reply was that none had been received from him.

Nominations Confirmed.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 12.—The senate today confirmed these nominations: Henry K. Boyer, of Pennsylvania, to be superintendent of the mint at Philadelphia; P. J. Miniter, assayor in charge of the assay office at Deadwood, S. D.; L. A. Walker, melter of the assay office, at Helena, Mont.