

OHIO'S GREAT FIGHT FOR DECENT GOVERNMENT

Columbus, Ohio, October 16.—(Special Correspondence.)—A few weeks ago Chairman Dick uttered the sneering boast that the democrats had the faculty of winning every election in September and October, yet the republicans came along in November and got the certificates of election. This boast was a sneer, but even Chairman Dick did not realize when he uttered it how much of truth there was in it. Democrats win elections early because they deserve to win. And this is particularly true in the present campaign.

In 1896, Ohio was carried for Bryan in October. It was not thought at that stage that even a hocus-pocus count could rob him of its electoral vote. But those votes were not placed to his credit. Yet every intelligent man knows that he fairly won them. There are no sour grapes in this. No Ohio democrat is complaining. All are willing to let the past bury its own dead. Chairman Dick accuses us of winning in sentiment, winning in hope, winning in aspiration, winning in fact, but admonishes us that only the tally sheet counts in the long run. And what is more important, he intimates that he and Boss Cox have charge of the tally sheet.

The democracy of Ohio is a loyal, patriotic band, which like all similar organizations looks for recompense only in the triumph of right. This organization may be sufficiently timid that even this year it is now looking about for that proverbial re-action which denies it victory; but it looks in vain. There is no re-action and will be none. Republicans tagged by the boss, have told us every day that things were bad from their standpoint, but would grow better as soon as the re-action set in. If democrats hunt for this re-action, they will compel themselves to believe that they have found it; but if they will only take the cue from our honest republican brethren who are open in their manifestation of patriotism and support of Mr. Pattison, they will be militant until at the last victory, personified in the rooster, will perch upon the banner borne on the highways of every village, hamlet and school district in the buckeye state on the evening of November 7.

There is no revulsion of sentiment. Word is given out at democratic state headquarters every day that things are growing better, and it is not given out perfunctorily. Democratic campaign managers don't talk this year like they have talked in years ago. They talk in a spirit of confidence. They will compel any man to believe that they know whereof they affirm, and tell us that each day brings new converts to Mr. Pattison's cause. They can tell you precisely the condition that exists in every precinct in Ohio. They are in closer touch with their organization than democrats were ever known to be

before in the history of the state. No name can be mentioned that is new to those in charge of the democratic campaign. They know the situation in every school district in Ohio, and they do not fear the result. The only thing that seems to concern them is their ability to so arouse the democrats as to be able to secure a full poll. If all democrats vote there is no question about the result. I know this because I have come in personal contact with those in charge of affairs, and I feel that The Commoner is safe in making the pledge that if the democratic vote of Ohio is polled John M. Pattison will be the next governor of the Buckeye state.

Governor Herrick is making frantic efforts to defend himself. He may not have lost his head, but his defense is really incoherent, hysterical, if not vicious. Governor Herrick, in his public addresses has posed as the advocate of temperance legislation. According to him he has been the guardian of the public morals of the state. But last night, in his address at Athens, the home of General Charles H. Grosvenor, Mr. Pattison propounded this inquiry: "If Governor Herrick is the sponsor for all temperance legislation and the advocate of all moral propositions, why is it that every saloon, every brewer, every distiller in Ohio is supporting him?" Mr. Pattison stated clearly that this fight was a fight between right and wrong, and so far as he was concerned he believed that there were more people in Ohio who believed in right than there are who are champions of the cause of wrong. A letter has been published in fac simile in every democratic, independent and anti-Herrick republican paper in the state of Ohio, from the Fleischman Distillery company, imploring the saloon keepers, the brewers, the distillers of the state to support Mr. Herrick. The president of this company is the mayor, by virtue of Cox, of Cincinnati. The connection is complete. It has gone so far that even those to whom the letter was addressed have not denied its authenticity. Every man in the state who looks to Cox for favor, or looks to the interests which have made him a power for consideration is beseeched to vote for Herrick. Why? The democratic committee echoes the inquiry throughout the state. Why? If these men are true to their principles, which it is granted they are, why are not other men who believe in justice and truth and a high moral standard not likewise interested in the outcome of this campaign. And between right and wrong, law and anarchy, justice and injustice, truth and falsehood, isn't it natural for the democratic campaign managers to conclude that there are more people on the side of right than there are on the side of license?

In his explanation of the inheritance tax law that the last legislature enacted at his behest, Governor Herrick pointed to the fact that other states, notably Illinois and New York, had passed

a similar law, but he gave no facts and no details. The truth is that in Illinois inheritances exceeding \$20,000 per heir are taxed one per cent. While in Ohio inheritances exceeding \$3,000 per heir are taxed two per cent. It is the small estates that have paid taxes during the life of him or her that made them are taxed. And this tax is not paid into the local funds of each county or particular division, but is paid into the state treasury to the end, as has been proved by figures, that new offices may be created and fat salaries be paid. Governor Herrick's administration has winked at every effort made by his legislature to raise additional funds by taxation for the purpose of paying salaries to newly created officials, who are the creatures of local republican bosses. It is not claimed by any one that these extra offices have been created for any other purpose than to provide for henchmen, and the widow is robbed, the orphan is robbed, the very coffin is sacked that the salaries of these men may be paid.

People outside of Ohio, and I regret to say that many inside of Ohio, do not appreciate the single issue that is involved in this campaign. That issue is graft, and graft is the fruit of bossism; and therefore we go back to the original cause of all this disturbance and we place the responsibility upon one George B. Cox. His absolute domination of Cincinnati has made him ambitious to absolutely dominate Ohio as a state. He has improved upon the Philadelphia machine to such an extent that Durham and Penrose, and Quay, if he were living, would blush at their own mediocrity. Cincinnati under his control, without question or protest, he now seeks to make the Buckeye state equally subservient. In every county he has a representative, and that representative is the head of the local organization. These organization propose to make him a United States senator for value received. If the state organization of which he is head, of which Herrick is sponsor, and of which Chairman Dick is merely a nominal director can count on a victory this fall, Ohio electors will be in such thrall as would have warmed the cockles of the herd of a Simon Cameron, or have been the pride of an Oliver Cromwell, who believed in discipline publicly proclaimed.

The question resolves itself into this: Will democracy avail itself of the privilege? Will democrats vote? If so, there is no question whatever about the result. John M. Pattison will be elected governor of Ohio. There is no doubt, whatever in the minds of the committee as to the result. And yet it is claiming no partisan credit. If Pattison wins, it will be a victory for truth. Republicans of other years are democrats this year simply because democracy is truth. If the Bryan vote can be polled Mr. Pattison's majority will exceed that of any other candidate whose name was ever printed on a ballot in Ohio.

PENNSYLVANIA AND OHIO

Between Pennsylvania and Ohio the Roosevelt administration is having difficulty in keeping its morals "on straight." In Philadelphia the republican party is in control of what is known as "the Durham gang." The popular uprising against that gang is apparent, and conspicuous representatives of the administration have made it a point to emphasize the fact that the administration's sympathies are with the decent element which, under the leadership of Mayor Weaver, has been waging war with the Durhams, otherwise known as the republican party of Philadelphia.

A republican paper says: "Secretary Root has made it plain in the case of Philadelphia that a national political party should not be held under obligation to uphold a corrupt local machine, simply because that machine happens to masquerade under the party name."

When Senator Foraker of Ohio accepted an invitation to go to Philadelphia and speak in behalf of the republican ticket, he was severely criticised by members of his own party. Friends of Mr. Roosevelt are conspicuous among those who thus criticised the Ohio senator. Why does the administration reject boss ridden Pennsylvania only to embrace boss ridden Ohio? We are told that several members of the cabinet will take the stump in Ohio in behalf of the Herrick ticket which, just as the Durham ticket in Philadelphia, is known as the republican ticket but which is in fact the Boss Cox ticket.

If members of the President's cabinet can go to Ohio in behalf of the Boss Cox ticket on the theory that that ticket represents the republican party, why may not Senator Foraker go to Pennsylvania in defense of the Boss Durham ticket, on the theory that the Durham ticket represents the republican party? And if Mr. Roosevelt's administration makes bold to array itself against the republican organization in Philadelphia because that organization has surrendered itself to a disreputable boss, why can not that administration summon sufficient courage to at least withhold its approval from the boss ridden republican machine in Ohio?

Mr. Roosevelt would do well to refuse to send his cabinet officials to Ohio. It is plain that thousands of republicans in that state have grown weary of government by Boss Cox. If Boss Cox should win the victory with the help of the administration it would be no credit to Mr. Roosevelt or the members of his official family. If, in spite of the administration's help Boss Cox should be defeated, Mr. Roosevelt's popularity would hardly be strengthened, and his reputation as a reformer would hardly be improved.

IS MACHINERY ANTIQUATED?

Recently President Roosevelt declared that "the machinery of the department of justice has been strained to the utmost" in an effort to punish the beef trust. The Kansas City Journal, a staunchly republican organ remarks in this con-

nection "that if the president's statement is correct "it is clearly apparent that the machinery of justice is entirely too antiquated and clumsy to protect society."

The Journal's point may or may not be well taken. There is an old adage to the effect that "a poor workman blames his tools," and there is a general belief on the part of the people that the machinery is adequate but that the engineers and operators lack either training or the disposition to use the machinery as intended by those who constructed it. The machinery of the department of justice works smoothly enough when a little criminal is to be ground between the wheels, and it would seem equally easy to grind a big criminal through by merely adjusting the running gear.

It would seem that the trouble lies in the fact that lawyers who are retained to defend criminals take more interest in the work than the lawyers who are retained by the public to protect society. If the machinery of justice is in disrepute, if the people are losing confidence in the courts, lawyers owe it to themselves and to their profession to so conduct themselves as to bring about a better condition of affairs and give the people visible proof that the courts deal out equal and exact justice regardless of the wealth or social position of the prisoners at the bar.

It is hardly possible that the machinery of justice is antiquated. It is more than possible that some of its engineers are more interested in holding sinecures than they are in getting good work out of the machine.