

the 31st of December, 1889, the passenger traffic increased by over three million persons, and the gross receipts by over 50,000 pounds, or about \$250,000. As the total number of people annually carried by the Hungarian railroads has not, hitherto, exceeded 1,500,000 persons, the large increase in five months is remarkable. It is said that no extra expense has been incurred, and, in fact, that economies have been effected in the ticket issue department, owing to the facilities now afforded for obtaining tickets at postoffices, stores, and other places in town. In real truth, the Hungarians send themselves by stamps, just as they and we do our letters. This is a showing that merits the most careful attention, and especially when it is remembered that the State railways of Hungary cover only 6,170 miles. The fare is so low that a ride of six miles costs only one cent, moreover the wages of railroad men have been doubled since government ownership began. Vrooman's report of the German railroads are that the government first assumed the ownership of the railways in 1843.

The cost to the end of 1892 has been 10,626,246,000 marks. Receipts for 1892 on Government roads were 1,348,864,000 marks. Expenses, 877,054,000 marks. Profits, 472,810,000 marks (or 4.4 cents). The average passenger fare is .0117 per mile and the average freight rate is .0147 per ton per mile. During the last ten years the profits have increased 41 per cent, and wages are 120 per cent. higher than under private ownership. The fare for third class travel (which is a large per cent. of all) is only one cent for four miles. The State employed 340,553 persons on railways in 1890, and paid them 404,286,555 marks (about \$90,220,000). There were 59,130 other persons employed in shops on repairing, gas making, etc. There were 1,316 employed for every 100 miles of road in 1890. There were 7,331 stations and 1,305 signal stations.

In speed the law prescribes a limit of 50 to 55 miles per hour for main line passenger trains with air brakes. The fastest trains in the world, taking average speed, are on the Berlin & Hamburg line of 178 miles, where the rates for through passenger trains average 48.9 miles an hour.

Now then you will note that the average rate on freight is .0147 cents per ton mile. The study of this per ton mile rate on freight is an interesting study. I hold in my hand a receipted freight bill for the freight charges on a car load of oil well supplies shipped from Harmony, Pa., to Unity, Pa., a distance of 49 miles; the cost was \$46.60 for the car load of 16 tons, or \$2.91 per ton for the 49 miles, or 5.93 cents per ton mile. Here I have another freight bill that shows that I paid 4.32 cents per ton mile. Both of these shipments were of the fifth and sixth class, and I take it that these bills are about the average freight rates that the people pay on the transportation of their products, but the statistics show that the average of all the freight shipments of the United States is only .85 of 1 cent per ton mile. These facts convict the railroad managers of a great crime. For these freight bills here show that the public is being robbed for the benefit of the stockholder, while the statistics show that the stockholders are being robbed for the benefit of the trusts, monopolies and favored shippers. Here is a problem. If the average cost for freight in

America is only .85 of one cent per ton mile, and the public is obliged to pay from 4.32 to 5.93 cents per ton mile, then in order to bring the average freight rate of the country down to .85 of one cent per ton mile, what must the monopolies and favored shippers pay? The answer to this question would answer the ever occurring question: Why are so many of our railroads in the hands of receivers? The facts are that many of these bankrupt roads have been robbed for the benefit of the favored shippers, just as the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe railroad was.

In the United States, under corporate ownership, in 1892, the railways carried 575,770,000 passengers, and killed 7,047 passengers, and injured 37,164, including employes. Under government ownership, in Germany, in 1892, the German railroads carried 464,013,000 passengers, killed 726 passengers, and injured 2,542 passengers. The figures show that the persons killed under corporate ownership in the United States, are nearly one thousand per cent greater than they are under government ownership, in Germany, and that the people injured under corporate ownership is nearly six hundred per cent greater than they are under government ownership. These figures speak volumes, and I present them to you for your earnest consideration.

In conclusion let me say, that the power of the ten billions of capital organized in the highways of the Republic, backed by the billions of the monopolies and trusts organized in one common conspiracy to take from the people the wealth produced by them, is a power that is taking away the control of government from the intelligent rule of the masses, and we must shake loose these fetters that bind us, or American liberties are lost, and lost forever.

The author of the "Highways of the Republic," is a thorough Democrat. He at one time ably represented his district in the State legislature and has always taken a leading part in every forward movement of the party.

With him Democracy means the rule of the common people; government administered for the protection of their rights, the preservation of their liberties, the advancement of their interests, the promotion of their welfare. He looks upon the Democratic party as the party of the people, and believes that it should be this at all times everywhere. He is an ardent supporter of the principles of the Chicago platform, believing them to be the expression of true Democracy, and hopes to see them made the basis of government by the triumphant election, in 1900, of the great advocate and exponent, William J. Bryan.—EDITOR.

BRYAN ON THE RATIO.

The Great Leader Says Silver is the Issue and 16 to 1 the Ratio.

No one believes that bimetalism will prove a panacea for all political ills, but the money question must be settled before other questions can be reached. Financial independence is a condition precedent to reform along other lines. The power that controls our financial policy can control the policy of our government on every other subject whenever occasion arises for the exercise of that control. Suppose, for instance, that the money question were dropped and the fight against the trusts made the main issue. Much foreign capital is invested in trusts, and foreign financiers could announce that any legislation hostile to trusts would be followed by the

withdrawal of foreign capital and a panic. If they can threaten the withdrawal of foreign capital to prevent a change of our financial policy, they can threaten such withdrawal to prevent the annihilation of trusts or the regulation of other corporations. Not only can this threat be made in regard to our domestic policy, but it can be made to prevent the adoption of any foreign policy which does not meet with favor in Europe. We cannot protect the rights of our citizens, avenge an insult to the flag, enforce the Monroe doctrine or express our sympathy with those who are struggling to be free if we are to be deterred by the threats of foreign investors. The right to legislate for our people on the money question involves the right to legislate on all questions, and until this right is secured the discussion of other questions will avail nothing. When we have released ourselves from the dictation of foreign financiers and overthrown the local money trust which controls our financial policy, we shall be in a position to undertake the extermination of other trusts and the protection of our people from all forms of monopolistic oppression.

The other planks of the Chicago platform are not abandoned. Those who favor free coinage at 16 to 1 advocate and will carry out all the other reforms enumerated in the platform, but they will not lessen the emphasis placed upon the money question by the party itself in its latest utterances.

Why 16 to 1?

But there are some who admit the necessity for bimetalism and who confess that it can only be secured by independent action, but suggest a change of ratio. They ask, Why 16 to 1? I answer that there are several reasons. Sixteen to one is the ratio at which we had free coinage from 1834 to 1873. It is the ratio now existing between the gold and silver coins in circulation, and it is more favorable to gold than the ratio now existing in most European countries.

To change the ratio by independent action, besides changing existing contracts, lessening our currency and incurring great expense, would put us out of harmony with other nations. Especially would it put us out of harmony with France, the European nation most friendly to silver, where the ratio is 15 1/2 to 1. If by international agreement we should change the ratio to 82 to 1, for instance, it would necessitate the recoinage of more than \$4,000,000,000 of silver into coins twice as large (provided the change was made by increasing the size of the silver coins). To double the size of the silver coin of the world would diminish by one-half the silver money of the world. It would diminish by one-quarter the entire volume of metallic money of the world. Such a shrinkage in the volume of money would in effect add billions of dollars to the debts of the world. Should so great an injury be done without the necessity for it being proved beyond a reasonable doubt?

Bimetalists contend that gold and silver have been driven apart by hostile legislation and that they can be brought together by friendly legislation. They contend that legislation favorable to gold has increased the purchasing power of an ounce of gold throughout the world and lowered the general level of prices, while the same legislation has lessened the demand for silver and lowered the gold price of that metal. They contend that the restoration of the free and unlimited coinage by a great nation like the United States will increase the demand for silver to a point where the mints will require all the surplus silver of the world, and thus by raising the gold price of silver and lowering the purchasing power of an ounce of gold will restore the parity at 16 to 1 and thereafter maintain the parity at that ratio.

It is true that some bimetalists do not believe that this nation alone can maintain the parity at that ratio, but shall the great majority who do believe surrender their conviction to the comparatively few who doubt? Upon what

principle can a minority demand of the majority the right to dictate a platform? Those who are opposed to the gold standard must act together, and the plan of action must be determined by the majority. The moment the ratio of 16 to 1 is surrendered our silver plank loses its force. Those who oppose the ratio of 16 to 1 are not agreed among themselves. No considerable body of men ask for any other specific ratio. One man says 20 to 1, another 24, another 32, but all the objectors together are small in number when compared with those who firmly believe in the ability of this nation to maintain the parity at 16 to 1. If it is proposed to leave the ratio to congress it must be remembered that those who desire bimetalism demand affirmative action, and every one opposed to the ratio fixed in any proposed bill will be counted against any kind of bimetalism. If the ratio is left to be determined by congressmen who run upon different platforms, it gives a chance for a variety of ratios which will effectually prevent any legislation favorable to bimetalism and will also give a chance for friends of the gold standard to slip into congress under the pretense of favoring some undefined ratio, but who, as a matter of fact, would use their positions to maintain the gold standard.

The Popular Ratio.

The ratio of 16 to 1 has been adopted by the Democratic party in a convention which, more than any recent convention, received its authority direct from the people. The rank and file of the party, instead of leaving the ratio to the leaders, expressed their own opinion upon the subject, and that opinion has not changed since the convention. This ratio has also been endorsed by the Populist party, the National Silver party and the Silver Republicans. To abandon the ratio would be wrong in itself and as impolitic as it would be wrong. If the Democratic party were to allow its policy on this question to be determined by a few doubting Thomases, or by the deserters who supported the enemy in the great struggle between democracy and plutocracy, it would lose the respect and confidence of those who now look to it as an efficient means of restoring government of the people. To turn from its clear and courageous enunciation to wallow again in the mire of ambiguity and deception would alienate those who have been drawn to it by the platform of 1896.

The Democratic party could have remained within its folds, the deserters of 1896 if it had consented to a meaningless platform, but it preferred to lose some members of the body rather than have the whole body destroyed. Regeneration did not come too soon. The gold Democrats were rapidly making the party a rival of the Republican party for the favor of trusts and monopolies. If the Chicago platform did nothing else, it drove from the party those who had been manipulating the party for private gain and using the government for public plunder. There are many of these deserters whose return to the party would bring weakness rather than aid strength, and there are millions of Democrats who would not surrender a single line of the Chicago platform to recover every deserter who left because of real antagonism to the principles set forth in that platform. I do not refer to those who were misled. There were many who left because they did not fully understand the issues raised, and they are coming back of their own accord because they find themselves in sympathy with our platform.

The party can win more voters by steadfastly standing by the right than by weakly compromising with error, and those who went back to the platform will be useful when they return, while those who profess attachment to the Democratic name rather than to Democratic principles will always require watching.

The Democratic party has put its hand to the plow, and unless I mistake the spirit which animates the members it will not look back.

W. J. BRYAN.