

IS THIS A FACT?

In the course of an able and generally fair editorial in the *Atchison Champion* of May 8 we find the following statement:

The republican party never legislated for the benefit of foreign powers. It never coined or printed a dollar in the interest of the Bank of England or the gold barons of Europe.

Governor, is this true? Let us see. In this very article from which the above clipping is taken you speak of the mischievous consequences of Clevelandism, but you fail to point out specifically wherein Clevelandism differs from republicanism. Have there been any changes in our laws since Clevelandism superceded Harrisonism? Yes, one; the purchasing clause of the Sherman law has been repealed. Who repealed it? Was it not done by republican votes? Could it have been accomplished without them? What other laws have been changed? Who placed the laws upon the statute books which govern Mr. Cleveland's administration? Are those laws enforced differently by Mr. Cleveland from what they have been and would be again by a republican president? What legislation have we upon our statute books that is in the interest of foreign powers, and who put it there? We would like something specific on this subject.

You say "the republican party never coined or printed a dollar in the interest of the Bank of England or the gold barons of Europe." Have we any variety of dollars, my dear sir, that the republican party did not coin, or for the coinage of which it did not provide? When did Cleveland or the democratic party provide for the coinage of any dollars? Have we any dollars that have been "coined in the interest of the Bank of England or the gold barons of Europe?" If so who made them?

We did have that kind of dollars at one time. When the republican party, by its representatives in congress in 1862, authorized the creation of dollars and by the very act creating them placed the stamp of discredit upon them; it made just the kind of dollars that the *Champion* speaks of. Those dollars were good enough for the soldier and the soldier's widow and orphan children; they were good enough for the farmer who furnished in exchange for them the bread and meat with which the army was fed; they were good enough for the man who furnished the clothing with which the army was supplied; they were good enough for all American citizens in whatsoever occupation engaged except one. The man who upon the approach of danger hid away his gold and refused to even loan it to the government as a means of saving the republic; for that man alone these government discredited dollars were not good enough, and a brilliant little scheme was devised by a republican congress for his especial accommodation.

It is a generally accepted belief that the government bonds were issued to procure money to defray the expenses of the war. This is a mis-

take. When the gold barons refused to loan money to the government, these purposely discredited dollars were made and used to defray the expenses of the war. The government bonds were an invention designed for these patriotic gold barons to speculate upon, and they knew very well how to do it. The discredited dollars were legal tender except for two things—duties on imports and interest on the public debt? What public debt? Did the reader ever stop to reflect that there was no public debt to speak of when the law was enacted for the creation of these dollars? The interest which these dollars wouldn't pay was on the debt yet to be made. How was that debt made? By the retirement of the discredited dollars in exchange for the interest-bearing bonds. It worked in this way: The merchant who imported a cargo of goods from a foreign country must needs have gold to pay the duties, as the government declined to receive its own paper dollars. Who had the gold? Where must the merchant go to find it? Why, to the patriot who hid it away when the war broke out. Nobody else had any. What had the merchant with which to purchase this gold? Nothing but the discredited dollars, and he had to strike the best bargain he could with the government favorite for whose benefit these dollars were made. The price ranged from \$1.25 to \$2.85 of the discredited dollars for one of gold. Having made a trade of this kind with the merchant, the gold baron was now ready for a deal with the government, and he lost no time in investing his paper dollars in interest-bearing bonds at par.

It is in this way that the bonds were issued, and Senator Morton stated that they actually cost the gold barons an average of not over 60 cents on the dollar. The merchant on the other hand, having secured his gold, paid it over to the government for duties on his cargo of goods. About six months later, the first interest payment on the bonds became due; and the government returned the gold to its former owner, and he was then ready for another victim. Soon afterwards this same republican congress provided for the payment of the interest on the bonds in advance so that the gold baron didn't have to wait six months for another deal.

There is also another beautiful feature to this scheme. The merchant, of course, was obliged to add to the cost of his goods, not only the duty on them, but also the premium which he paid on the gold; and the soldier's wives and widows, and the people generally, who received only the discredited dollars, had to stand this premium as well as all the other elements of cost. And yet the *Champion* says the republican party never coined or printed a dollar in the interest of the Bank of England or the gold barons of Europe. Perhaps the *Champion* will say these dollars were only in the interest of the gold barons of America, but inasmuch as many of the bonds turned up in Eu-

rope, it is fair to infer that the gold barons over there had some interest in the deal. Whether this be true or not, the average American citizen will hardly be able to distinguish the advantages of being robbed by a native rather than a foreign pirate.

But this is not all there is in the scheme. The bonds as originally issued were payable "in legal money of the United States," which at that time consisted of gold, silver and treasury notes; and a republican congress and republican administration have, by subsequent acts, made them payable in gold, thereby multiplying the burden of the people and the profits of the gold barons. No democrat had any hand in this scheme. It was republican in its origin and in its execution. The democratic party is guilty of enough, God knows, but this is not one of its sins. Don't let your prejudices run away with your judgment, governor. Be fair.

CHICKENS COMING HOME TO ROOST.

The *Capital* of Sunday morning, May 6, devotes a column and a half of its editorial page "in reply to the columns of abuse and lying misrepresentations of A. G. Stacy." It so happens that the said Stacy has been giving some attention to the affairs of the *Capital* and its editor recently, and this is what has excited the ire of that great moral daily. In justification of this editorial the *Capital* says:

We feel that we owe our readers an apology for taking the necessary space to expose this corrupt and malicious scoundrel but we feel it due to ourselves and the newspaper fraternity to give the facts, etc.

Now the *Advocate* does not propose to be a party to any attempt to damage the business interests of the *Capital* by a re-publication of Mr. Stacy's purported exposure of its financial or private affairs. The *Capital* has on several occasions attempted to embarrass the *Advocate* in this way, but we shall not follow its disreputable example in this case. Nor do we propose to undertake any defense of Mr. Stacy. We have exposed his character as a correspondent on several former occasions. The *Capital* has understood it thoroughly for years, but so long as Mr. Stacy confined his "lying and misrepresentation" to the Alliance, to the People's party and to People's party officials, it manifested great readiness to give his stuff publicity as the very finest quality of republican gospel. The *Capital* has re-published pages of his fake correspondence from Eastern papers without ever thinking of offering an apology to its readers or of "exposing the scoundrel" who wrote it. Since Mr. Stacy has turned his attention to the *Capital*, however, it has become necessary for the editor of the great moral daily to round him up. It is only a case of one of the *Capital's* favorite chicks coming home to roost, and there is really no occasion for so much fuss about it. There are others of the same brood that the *Capital* still has under its wing. There is D. O. McCray for instance, who writes the same quality of stuff, the one directly for the *Capital*, and the

other for Eastern papers from which the *Capital* copies it. So long as they confine their efforts to the People's party, however, it is all right, and even Mr. Stacy's stuff in this line would still be copied without apology. Oh, what journalism! It requires a very high order of intelligence and moral character to run the *Capital*.

THE INDUSTRIAL ARMY BILL.

We print in another column this week the industrial army bill of which Mrs. Diggs is the author. Although there is no probability of such a bill being adopted by the tools of Wall street now in control of congress, Mrs. Diggs feels somewhat elated in consequence of its introduction. In a private letter speaking of its scope and possibilities she says: □

I am happy to have been able to carry out a cherished desire in securing the service of Mr. Davis in introducing my "Industrial Army" bill, which I believe to be an entering wedge, and avast courier of the new and blessed social order. I also believe that its speedy enactment by congress would relieve present distress and tide the republic past a perilous crisis, avoid the appeal to arms, which multitudes of thoughtful people believe to be imminent, and prove a peaceful solution of the nation's problem.

Old Schwab, the anarchist pardoned out by Governor Altgeld, is tearing around making blood-curdling speeches again. If Schwab is smart, he will keep his mouth in Herr Altgeld's bailiwick.—*Emporia Republican*.

Why don't you publish what Mr. Schwab says and let your readers judge of its "blood-curdling" character. You have shown yourself heretofore to be a very unfair and prejudiced witness upon this subject, and people have mighty little confidence in your testimony. Besides this there is a fair prospect that the voters of Kansas will not be frightened this year nor influenced by prejudice as they have been in former years. They will be governed rather by an educated judgment, and in a campaign of this character your occupation will be something like Othello's.

SEVERAL correspondents in answer to our request for postal card opinions respecting the initiative and referendum as a party platform are branching out into lengthy arguments upon the subject. This was not our idea in making this request. We simply desire opinions without argument and so briefly expressed that a postal card will contain them, so that a large number of them may be published each week in order that the general trend of public sentiment upon the subject may be ascertained. These lengthy communications will defeat the object we had in view because they consume so much space that only a few can be used.

BUSINESS men are demanding that congress pass the Wilson bill. Business men demanded that the Sherman law be repealed.—*Kansas City Gazette*.

Aye, and republican votes repealed it in order to "restore confidence and revive prosperity."

For good People's party argument get Weaver's "Quadrangular Debate." See our premium list.

Apply at once to the *Advocate* for special club terms.