PART 2. THE DESERET EVENING NEWS. 9 TO 12.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

FORTY-NINTH YEAR. MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 1899. SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH. NUMBER 40.

TWO PARTY LEADERS.

Colonel Bryan and General Grosvenor Define the Policy of Their Respective Parties.

COLONEL BRYAN'S SPEECH.

Free Coinage of Silver and Anti-Expansion the Democratic Doctrines.

Chicago, Jan. 7.—The third annual banquet of the Andrew Jackson league was held at the Tremont house here tonight and on this occasion, as on the two former, William J. Bryan was the guest of honor. He spoke as follows:

The Democracy of the nation is still defending Jeffersonian principles with Jacksonian courage, and has no thought of departing from the principles enunciated at Chicago in 1896. That platform will live in history and the hour of its adoption will be remembered as the hour when the money-changers were driven from the Democratic temple. There will be no turning back. The platform will be added to as new conditions force new issues into the arena of politics, but nothing will be subtracted from it. Events have vindicated every position taken by the platform. Arbitration was advocated in that platform and arbitration is stronger today than it was in 1896.

That platform denounced government by injunction, and the sentiment against government by injunction is increasing.

That platform denounced the trusts and declared them to be a menace; that menace is greater today than ever before.

That platform warned the people that a conspiracy was on foot to give to the national banks a monopoly of the issue and supply of paper money; that conspiracy is now known to everyone.

That platform denounced international bimetalism as a delusion and a snare, and its condemnation has been justified.

That platform pointed to independent free coinage as the only means of restoring the double standard; who doubts it now?

That platform named 16 to 1 as the proper ratio, and that ratio stands today as the only ratio at which bimetalism is possible.

Other platforms have been forgotten, but that platform is fresh in the memory of friend and foe because it was clear and positive upon every public question. To those who believe in equality before the law the Chicago platform is still an inspiration; it is a terror only to those who seek to use the government for personal and private ends.

GOLD STANDARD, FALLING PRICES.

It has been attacked at two points, but the attacks will not harm it. Some who opposed the platform in 1896 have promised to return to the party on condition that the party will drop the money question and confine the fight to the trusts. The offer will not be accepted. What confidence would the people have in our sincerity if we should declare against trusts in general but refer the question of power with the greatest of all trusts—the money trust? If we should attempt to center the fight upon the trusts the Republicans would adopt so strong an anti-trust plank as we, because no party would dare to defend the trusts. In such a fight the trust magnates would be found supporting both parties and contributing largely to both campaign funds, provided the trusts were guaranteed the privilege of naming the attorney general and the judges.

The trusts opposed the Democratic party in 1896 because the Chicago convention told the party out of the hands of the Wall street crowd and adopted a platform which prostituted the platform which the party had held in solution for several years.

The gold Democrats had an opportunity to crush out the trusts during Mr. Cleveland's administration, but they did not do it. The gold Republicans are having their opportunity now, but they are not improving it. The trusts will fail when the gold standard is overthrown, and not until then. The gold standard means falling prices, and falling prices will create trusts more rapidly than any gold standard party can destroy them.

ATTACK ON RATIO.

The second point of attack is the ratio. Why insist upon 16 to 1? they ask. I reply first, because it is the best ratio, and second because its opponents have no other ratio to offer. No free coinage law can be enacted until a ratio is agreed upon, because the ratio is a part of the law. In 1893 we had a majority in Congress favorable to bimetalism, but differing as to the ratio. Some would favor 18 to 1, others 20 to 1, others 22 to 1, and some even higher ratios; how could we make progress under such conditions? Affirmative relief is necessary, and those who favor remedial legislation must secure a majority in both House and Senate for some definite proposition.

The goldbugs understand this; they know that an ambiguous platform is equivalent to a gold-standard platform. Mr. Cleveland was elected in 1892 upon a platform which declared for the use of gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and for the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage; and yet Mr. Cleveland found no difficulty in squarely before the law the Chicago platform is still an inspiration; it is a terror only to those who seek to use the government for personal and private ends.

GOLD STANDARD, FALLING PRICES.

It has been attacked at two points, but the attacks will not harm it. Some who opposed the platform in 1896 have promised to return to the party on condition that the party will drop the money question and confine the fight to the trusts. The offer will not be accepted. What confidence would the people have in our sincerity if we should declare against trusts in general but refer the question of power with the greatest of all trusts—the money trust? If we should attempt to center the fight upon the trusts the Republicans would adopt so strong an anti-trust plank as we, because no party would dare to defend the trusts. In such a fight the trust magnates would be found supporting both parties and contributing largely to both campaign funds, provided the trusts were guaranteed the privilege of naming the attorney general and the judges.

The trusts opposed the Democratic party in 1896 because the Chicago convention told the party out of the hands of the Wall street crowd and adopted a platform which prostituted the platform which the party had held in solution for several years.

The gold Democrats had an opportunity to crush out the trusts during Mr. Cleveland's administration, but they did not do it. The gold Republicans are having their opportunity now, but they are not improving it. The trusts will fail when the gold standard is overthrown, and not until then. The gold standard means falling prices, and falling prices will create trusts more rapidly than any gold standard party can destroy them.

ATTACK ON RATIO.

The second point of attack is the ratio. Why insist upon 16 to 1? they ask. I reply first, because it is the best ratio, and second because its opponents have no other ratio to offer. No free coinage law can be enacted until a ratio is agreed upon, because the ratio is a part of the law. In 1893 we had a majority in Congress favorable to bimetalism, but differing as to the ratio. Some would favor 18 to 1, others 20 to 1, others 22 to 1, and some even higher ratios; how could we make progress under such conditions? Affirmative relief is necessary, and those who favor remedial legislation must secure a majority in both House and Senate for some definite proposition.

The goldbugs understand this; they know that an ambiguous platform is equivalent to a gold-standard platform. Mr. Cleveland was elected in 1892 upon a platform which declared for the use of gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and for the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage; and yet Mr. Cleveland found no difficulty in squarely before the law the Chicago

platform is still an inspiration; it is a terror only to those who seek to use the government for personal and private ends.

GOLD STANDARD, FALLING PRICES.

It has been attacked at two points, but the attacks will not harm it. Some who opposed the platform in 1896 have promised to return to the party on condition that the party will drop the money question and confine the fight to the trusts. The offer will not be accepted. What confidence would the people have in our sincerity if we