

a certain state, and, second, that their man is the only one who can carry that state, they do not put up a bond to deliver the votes. (Applause.) And then, anyhow, a state which is so uncertain that only one democrat in the nation can carry it, cannot be relied upon in a great crisis. (Applause.)

Select a candidate. If it is the wish of this convention that the standard shall be placed in the hand of the gentleman presented by California, a man who, though he has money, pleads the cause of the poor (Applause); the man who is best beloved, I think I can safely say, among laboring men, of all the candidates proposed; the man who more than any other represents opposition to the trusts—if you want to place the standard in his hand and make Mr. Hearst the candidate of this convention, Nebraska will be with you in the fight. (Applause.)

If you think that the gentleman from Wisconsin who, though faithful in both campaigns, was not with us on the money question—if you think that Mr. Wall, who agrees with the east on the gold question and with the west on other questions, would draw the party together, place the standard in his hand, and Nebraska will be with you and contribute her part. (Applause.)

If you prefer an eastern man and can find some one who will give both elements of the party something to believe in, something to trust in, something to hope for, we are willing to join you in selecting him as the standard-bearer.

Not all of the available men have been mentioned. There is in the state of Pennsylvania a man whom I desire to suggest, and I do it without consulting his delegation and without the consent of the man himself. He is an eastern man, who voted with us in both campaigns, although against us on the money question, but, I believe, he is in sympathy with the people; a man twice governor of a great state; a man who only two years ago when again a candidate carried the state of Pennsylvania, outside of the two great cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburg. (Applause.)

If you eastern democrats who insist that your objection to me is that I believe in free silver—if you are willing to take ex-Governor Pattison, a gold man, I am willing to let you have your way on that question, for I will trust his honesty on all questions. (Applause.) But I only mention these candidates by way of illustration.

I desire to second the nomination of a man whose name has already been presented, and I second his nomination, not because I can assert to you that he is more available than any other person who might be named, but because I love the man and because on the platform we have adopted there is no good reason why any democrat in the east should vote against him. I desire to second the nomination of Senator Cockrell of Missouri. (Applause.)

He is the nestor of the senate; he is experienced in public affairs. He is known; he has a record, and can be measured by it. I would be willing to write my indorsement on his back and guarantee everything he did. (Applause.)

It is said that he comes from the south. What if he does? I do not share the feeling that some have that the democratic party cannot take a candidate from the south. It is said he was in the confederate army. What if he was? I do not share the belief of those who say that we cannot afford to nominate an ex-confederate. (Applause.) That war, that cruel war, occurred forty years ago. Its issues are settled; its wounds are healed, and the participants are friends. We have another war on now, and those who know what the war between democracy and plutocracy means, will not ask where the candidate stood forty years ago; they will ask where he stands today—on which side he is fighting in the present conflict.

The great issue in this country today is "democracy versus plutocracy." I have been accused of having but one idea—silver. A while back it was said that I had only one, but then it was tariff reform. But there is an issue greater than the silver issue, the tariff issue or the trust issue. It is the issue between democracy and plutocracy—whether this is to be a government of the people, administered by officers chosen by the people, and administered in behalf of the people, or a government by the moneyed element of the country in the interest of predatory wealth. This issue is growing.

I ask you to help us meet this issue. You tell me that the republican candidate stands for militarism. Yes, but he also stands for plutocracy. You tell me that he delights in war. Yes, but there is another objection to him, and that is that he does not enforce the law against a big criminal as he does against a little criminal. The laws are being violated today, and those laws must be enforced. The government must be administered according to the maxim: "Equal

rights to all and special privileges to none." (Applause.)

We have had the debauchment of elections. It was stated the other day that into the little state of Delaware, two hundred and fifty-six thousand dollars were sent at one time just before the election of 1896. Some say that our party must have a great campaign fund and bid against the republicans. Let me warn you that if the democratic party is to save this nation, it must save it, not by purchase, but by principle. (Applause.) That is the only way to save it. Every time we resort to purchase, we encourage the spirit of barter. Under such a system the price will constantly increase, and the elections will go to the highest bidder. If the democratic party is to save this country, it must appeal to the conscience of the country. It must point out the dangers to the republic; and if the party will nominate a man, I care not from what part of the country he comes, who is not the candidate of a faction, who is not the candidate of an element, but the candidate of the party, the party will stand by him and will drive the republican party from power. (Applause.)

You could, I believe, take a man from any southern state—a man who would appeal to all democrats who love democratic principles, and to those republicans who begin to fear for their nation's welfare, and he would poll a million more votes than the candidate of any faction whose selection would be regarded as a triumph of a part of the party over the rest of the party. (Applause.)

I simply submit these suggestions for your consideration. I am here to discharge a duty that I owe to the party. I knew before coming to this convention that a majority of the delegates would not agree with me in regard to the financial plank. I knew that there would be among the delegates many who voted against me when I sorely needed their help. I am not objecting to the majority against me, nor to the presence of those who left us in 1896 and have since returned, but I am here, not because I enjoy being in the minority, but because I owe a duty to the more than six million brave and loyal men who sacrificed for the ticket in recent campaigns. (Applause.) I came to get them as good a platform as I could; I have helped to get them a good platform. (Applause.) I came to help to get as good a candidate as possible, and I hope that he will be one who can draw the factions together; one who will give to us who believe in positive, aggressive, democratic reform, something to hope for, something to fight for—one who will also give to those who have differed from us on the money question something to hope for, something to fight for. And I close with an appeal from my heart to the hearts of those who hear me: Give us a pilot who will guide the democratic ship away from the Scylla of militarism without wrecking her upon the Charybdis of commercialism. (Applause.)

### Candidate Davis' Age.

Some objection is being made to Mr. Davis, the democratic candidate for vice president, on account of his age. This objection is not valid. Mr. Davis, as all know who enjoy his personal acquaintance, is exceptionally well preserved for one of his age. No one would guess him more than seventy and doubtless he feels younger than that. To offset any argument that may be made against his age it must be remembered that his nomination encourages aspirants for high office to join the democratic party. In 1896 the party nominated a presidential candidate who was only thirty-six. As its vice presidential candidate is eighty it is evident from the record that there are forty-four years in every democrat's life, during which he is eligible to a place on the national ticket. What party can offer more in the way of opportunity?

### Slandering The Candidate.

The New York Herald seems to be trying to counteract the influence exerted by the Chicago Chronicle. The Chronicle is helping Parker by its support of Roosevelt and the Herald is helping Roosevelt by its support of Parker. In coming out for the democratic ticket the Herald says, "What the democrats needed was a master. They have found one in Judge Parker and he may yet lead them out of the wilderness." Certainly no editor who desired to help Judge Parker would advance such an argument in his behalf. Men may honestly differ as to the wisdom or even courage of Judge Parker in sending the telegram he did after keeping silent until the nomination was made, but one who asserts that the democratic

party needs a "master" must be either ignorant of human nature or indifferent to the candidate. The man chosen to present Judge Parker's name to the convention explained the judge's silence on public questions by saying that he was not the master of the party, but its servant. Judge Parker informed the convention (quite inopportunistly) of his views on one question which the convention had decided to ignore, but will he disregard the platform on the questions upon which the convention has spoken and upon which he has been silent? If the Herald wants to help the ticket it ought to point out, as the Commoner has done, the questions upon which Judge Parker is right and the republican party wrong.

### Those Labor Planks.

On page 13 of this issue will be found, under the caption, "Amending the Platform," an editorial from the Chicago Chronicle relating to the labor planks in the platform adopted at St. Louis. The Chronicle asserts that Mr. Bryan has been guilty of "making additions to the platform," and further asserts that "there is not a syllable in the democratic platform as telegraphed to Chicago on the subject of arbitration in labor troubles or about the eight-hour day in government work."

Mr. Bryan is in no wise responsible for what was "telegraphed to Chicago," but he is responsible for what appears in The Commoner. The best proof of what is in the platform is the platform itself. A copy of the platform certified by the official stenographer as correct in every word similar to the one read to the convention contains this plank, under the sub-head of "Capital and Labor":

We favor the enactment and administration of laws giving labor and capital impartially their just rights. Capital and labor ought not to be enemies. Each is necessary to the other. Each has its rights, but the rights of labor are certainly no less "vested," no less "sacred," and no less "inalienable" than the rights of capital.

We favor arbitration of differences between corporate employers and their employes, and a strict enforcement of the eight-hour law on all government work.

The Chronicle further says that "as to government by injunction the platform is equally silent about that also, unless reference is made to the indorsement of the senate bill on the subject of punishing contempt of court, which failed to pass in 1896."

Immediately following the planks above quoted the following appears in the platform adopted at St. Louis:

We approve the measure which passed the United States senate in 1896, but which a republican congress has ever since refused to enact, relating to contempts in federal courts and providing for trial by jury in cases of indirect contempt.

Substantially the same words were used in the "injunction plank" of the Chicago platform. That platform said:

We approve the bill passed at the last session of the United States senate, and now pending in the house of representatives, relative to contempts in federal courts, and providing for trials by jury in certain cases of contempt.

The Chronicle's inability to find what it does not want to find is in no wise chargeable to The Commoner or to Mr. Bryan. The platform speaks for itself.

### "Frenzied Finance."

Thomas W. Lawson, the Boston financier, is engaged in writing a series of articles for "Everybody's Magazine." These articles are entitled "Frenzied Finance: The story of Almagated." Mr. Lawson's conscience appears to have been quickened because he says that he has "unwittingly been made the instrument by which thousands upon thousands of investors in America and Europe have been 'plundered.'" He wishes to inform these investors of his intention in the past that that they may acquit him of intentional wrongdoing.

Mr. Lawson declares that the "system" to which the Amalgamated belongs "has for years as boldly, as coarsely, and as cruelly robbed the American people as the coolie slaves are robbed by their masters," and he ventures the prediction that when he has concluded his disclosures, the people will not be contented with the restora-