

The Advocate

AND TOPEKA TRIBUNE.

OFFICIAL STATE PAPER.

N. R. P. A.

PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY BY
THE ADVOCATE PUBLISHING COMPANY,
Rooms 43 and 45 Knox Building,
TOPEKA, KANSAS.

\$1.00 PER YEAR.

ADVERTISING RATES.

For single insertion: Display matter, 20 cents per line, 14 lines to the inch. Reading notices, 10 cents per line. Discount for long-time contracts.

Chicago Office { Ind. Rural Press Assoc'n,
P. G. VAN VLIET, Mgr.
Boycott Building.

Entered at the postoffice at Topeka, Kansas, as second class matter.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1894.



FOR CONGRESSMEN.

First district..... H. C. Solomon
Second district..... Frank L. Willard
Third district..... T. J. Hudson
Fourth district..... S. M. Scott
Fifth district..... John Davis
Sixth district..... William Baker
Seventh district..... Jerry Simpson
At-Large..... W. A. Harris

STATE OFFICERS.

For Governor..... L. D. Lewalling
For Associate Justice..... George W. Clark
For Lieutenant Governor..... D. I. Furbeck
For Secretary of State..... J. W. Amlis
For Auditor of State..... Van B. Prather
For Treasurer of State..... W. H. Biddle
For Attorney General..... John T. Little
For Superintendent of Public Instruction..... H. N. Gaines

By the way has anyone heard Dick Blue declare himself in favor of the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1.—Lawrence Journal.

Alas! no. Dick says the question of ratio is a mere matter of detail, and it is not worth while to talk about it now.

It those Populists who are so generously contributing to the support of the Kansas City Star were aware of the fact that the republican state central committee is a much more liberal patron of the vile sheet, their generosity might subside. The said committee has paid for 100,000 copies of the Star.

WHENEVER the republican party is in a hopeless minority it usually pursues one sensible line of policy; that is, it abandons the money power and appeals to the good sense and patriotism of the common people. That's why the republicans of Missouri are so emphatically demanding free coinage of silver.

THE SCREEN LAW UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

Judge J. S. West of the Sixth judicial district, has decided the screen law passed by the last legislature unconstitutional. So that ends the relief which the overworked and ill-paid miners supposed they were to obtain from one of the most outrageous abuses to which they were

subject. All that is necessary in these days, when the people revolt against any encroachment of capital and secure the passage of a law by the legislature to remedy the evil, is for the capitalist to get the law into court, and that most wonderful instrument, the "constitution," makes short work of it. Who says this is not a government by the people and for the people?

AMERICAN MONEY IN MEXICO.

We have received a letter from Professor C. P. Judd, under date, Hoxie, Kas., September 17, in which he says:

Bernard Kelly spoke here on the 15th and said: "I was in the city of Mexico last July. I went into a bank and put five standard silver dollars on the counter, asking for Mexican money in exchange, and they gave me ten Mexican dollars, containing 322 grains of pure silver. I afterwards offered them an American twenty dollar silver certificate, and they gave me thirty-nine and one-half Mexican dollars each of 322 grains of pure silver in exchange." He explained that Mexico has ruined its financial condition by free and unlimited coinage of silver.

It seems that Mr. Kelly is making this a great point in his speeches, as we have received reports of his statements from several other places, and it may therefore be well to puncture his little bubble and let the wind out of it.

In the first place, either Mr. Judd misunderstood Mr. Kelly, or Mr. Kelly does not know the weight of the Mexican dollar. The old Mexican dollar contained 416 grains of silver, .9 fine, and therefore contained 374.4 grains of pure silver. The Mexican dollars coined since 1873 contain 417.48 grains, and the American cyclopedia states the fineness at .903. Practically, therefore, we may consider the fineness equivalent to American standard silver and the Mexican dollar now contains 375.732 grains of pure silver.

It is a fact that United States money commands a premium in Mexico; and \$1 of United States money of any kind will bring at the Mexican banks nearly, if not quite, \$2 of Mexican silver, which is the money of that country. It is not for the reason, however, that Mr. Kelly states. How he, or any other person can get an argument out of the facts in this matter to sustain any republican theory of money is one of the unsolved mysteries. The republican theory is that money is intrinsic value—that our metallic dollar must contain a dollar's worth of metal in order to make it a dollar; and yet our United States silver dollar containing 412½ grains is worth at the Mexican banks two Mexican dollars each containing 417.48 grains. What becomes of the intrinsic value idea in view of this fact, and what is it that makes the smaller United States dollar worth two of the larger Mexican dollars? Will the gentleman explain?

Mr. Kelly is not honest in the use of his facts. He does not tell the whole truth. He only tells that part of the truth that he can distort into service of his selfish political purposes. Why did he exchange his United States money for Mexican

money when he was in Mexico? Why did not somebody think to ask him this question? If he could buy as much in Mexico with one of our dollars as with two Mexican dollars, why did he burden himself with two heavy Mexican silver dollars in exchange for it? Why did he exchange his \$20 silver certificate for \$39.50 Mexican silver? The fact is, the Mexican silver dollar is a legal tender for all purposes in Mexico, and one dollar of Mexican silver will pay a dollar's worth of hotel bill or railroad fare, or buy a full dollar's worth of any commodity in the Mexican market. United States money is not legal tender there and does not circulate in Mexican marts any more than Mexican money does here. Mr. Kelly, therefore, simply exchanged his money for money of the country and obtained the premium which Mexico is compelled to pay for gold; and the next question to consider is the motive of the Mexican banks in making such an exchange.

Mexico is a very large importing nation. She buys every year much more than she sells, and there is always a large balance of trade against her. This trade too is mostly with gold standard countries, and gold has to be secured with which to pay this balance. Now while the United States silver dollars are not directly redeemable in gold in this country, they are readily convertible here into greenbacks, and treasury notes issued in the purchase of silver bullion under the Sherman law of 1890, and it has been the uniform practice of this government to redeem these in gold, so that every dollar of United States money of any kind that the Mexican banks can buy is a means in their hands of securing gold with which to meet the Mexican balances of trade. It is true it costs them a heavy premium, but they are compelled to have it, and this is the penalty they pay to the gold mongers because of the general demonetization of silver throughout the world. It amounts to the same thing precisely as though the agents of the Mexican government should bring their silver here for the direct purchase of gold. On its arrival here it would bring just its bullion value in the market—no more. What Mexico is suffering from is an unwise and suicidal industrial and commercial system. It is not free coinage of silver that hurts her; it is the failure to produce what she needs to consume, or to produce an equivalent that she can exchange for what she can not produce. Mr. Kelly, instead of proving that free coinage of silver has "ruined the financial condition of Mexico," has only furnished another proof of the systematic robbery which the gold conspirators are able to practice, by the general adoption of their policy, upon the people of every nation under the sun. Assuming Mr. Kelly's position to be correct and, of course, the republican opposition to free coinage in this country would be consistent. What, then, of Major Morrill who says he is in favor of the free coinage of our American product at the ratio of 16 to 1? Would it not be well for Mr.

Kelly and Mr. Morrill to get together?

Mr. Kelly also says that Mexican miners only receive 75 cents per day "in Mexican dollars of depreciated value." His statement is misleading. The Mexican dollar is not depreciated in comparison with the commodities the miner has to purchase with it. It is only depreciated in comparison with gold, the great highway robbery of the world.

But over and above all other considerations, the extreme absurdity of Mr. Kelly's position is in the attempt to make political capital out of a comparison of such a country as Mexico with such a country as the United States, in any respect whatever.

That wages are extremely low in Mexico is true, but not lower than they will be in this country if the policy of the past thirty years is pursued much longer.

ROBUST HYPOCRISY.

The Kansas City Times gives the names and locations of forty-three saloons running openly in violation of law at Kansas City, Kas. It cannot be pretended by the reform administration that these places are unknown to the metropolitan police which are directly under control of, and responsible to the state administration.—Capital, September 21.

Can it be pretended that they are unknown to the republican county attorney of Wyandotte county and the republican city government of Kansas City? Section 2543 of the revised statutes makes the county attorneys of the several counties the very first officers upon whom the duty is imposed to see that the prohibitory law is enforced. If these places are running wide open as it is pretended they are, why don't your republican county attorney do his duty and close them up? It requires an everlasting amount of gall to be constantly referring to these violations of law and charging them up to the Populist administration when the very office upon which the law imposes the duty to suppress such things is in the hands of your own party. Such hypocritical cant is too thin to deceive anybody.

HOW THEY DIFFER.

If a poor woman takes a loaf of bread to keep her children from starving she is a common thief and the protection of society requires that she be "sent up."

If a rich woman steals goods from the counter of the merchant she is a kleptomaniac; and this disease is now charged with still another offense. The daughter of a wealthy Chicagoan, a certain Miss Ellsworth, was recently arrested in that city on the charge of forgery. It appears that she had deliberately forged a check and drawn the money on it, and the friends of the family now say: "The young woman is a kleptomaniac, if ever there was one." Of course, it would not do to have the daughter of one of Chicago's wealthy citizens designated as a common forger. This would be too awfully awful to think of.

WHICH way is that tidal wave of prosperity going? It hasn't come this way yet.