

A FULL VOTE WILL ELECT PATTISON IN OHIO

Columbus, Ohio, Oct. 21.—(Special Correspondence.)—The reaction so confidently predicted by those in support of the machine in this campaign has not appeared on the horizon of Ohio politics. Every year we are told that things will change; in many years things have changed. This year it must be frankly confessed that the democratic organization waited with bated breath for news of this very change which has not come. The prospects for Mr. Pattison's election as governor of Ohio are better today than they were on the day of his nomination in June. Democratic managers did halt and hesitate for ten days past awaiting the signal for a revulsion of sentiment. It has been their wont and custom to do so. They can not be blamed for the reluctance of the past few days, because past history amply justified them in expecting a revulsion that would lead them to defeat and lead their enemies to triumphant victory. Failing in the receipt of news that usually dampens their spirits, takes all the wind from their sails and leaves them as a painted ship upon a painted ocean, they have recovered their vigor, if it was ever lost, and are now more militant, more confident, more sure than before. It is a pleasure for your correspondent to record the fact that those in whom he expected weakness have displayed at the end a strength born of righteousness.

Governor Herrick, on the stump, has involved himself beyond the comprehension of a friend and has not worried a single foe. All that he says of his own acts is stated in the circumlocution of an official beggar. He has explained to none why he threatened to veto the Brannock bill. He has tried to do so and rests on the denseness of his explanation as a guarantee of its lucidity. He has utterly failed to answer to the indictment of bossism, and has plead in extenuation only that the bossism charged is confined to one county. He admits that Cox is the boss of Hamilton, but insists that he has never endeavored to extend his boss-ship beyond the limits of the single county in question. To the average voter who has felt the lash, this concession, for so it must be called, is absurd.

Therefore, as stated in the beginning, the democratic party through its organization is militant, confident and alert. It expects to win, and the candid observer who will disregard the Roosevelt vote of a year ago, must confess that the

democratic organization has grounds for its contention. The state committee, vowing it would ne'er consent, at last consented and sent frantic appeals to every county in the state for evidence of a re-acton and received in response the cheering assurance that there was no re-acton. There is none unless it may be said that new vows constitute such, and these vows are simply that Herrick shall lose.

Confidence has eliminated every element of doubt, and the "we shall win if," oft repeated at state headquarters, has been reduced to "We shall win." Every mail brings assuring responses from scores of local committeemen that "our vote" shall be polled. If that is true Mr. Pattison's majority will be numbered by tens, and even more, of thousands. The most rabid republican admits freely and frankly that if the democratic vote gets into the box and is counted Mr. Pattison will be elected governor. It is now the opinion of the state committee that Mr. Cox, though doing his worst, will be defeated and will be eliminated as a factor in the make-up of Buckeye respectability.

The open opposition of those who protest against the enforcement of the law has awakened to activity those who believe in the sanctity of the law. It is not a question of whether the law is good; but it is a question of obeisance to the statute. It is not a question of the merit or justice of what is written upon the statute books, but it is a question of official oaths. Candidate Pattison has not declared that all enactments are good; but he has declared that all enactments when made shall be enforced. He is opposed to all evasion and subterfuge. President of a life insurance company he refused, in 1896, to contribute of the savings of widows and orphans to the republican campaign funds. He refused to write in his contracts the offensive gold clause. He refused to join other life insurance presidents in a scare letter to policyholders admonishing them as to how they should vote. He has conducted his business as a business man in the open, and permitted those whose trustee he is to exercise their rights without intimidation from him, as their conscience may dictate. He voted for Bryan. He supported the Chicago platform; but he never suggested to any policyholder whether or not he should do the same thing. He then proved himself to be a big, broad man; and out of the fire of this campaign he will come even unsinged, unblistered and unscathed.

Indeed, the democracy in Ohio is now brought to the point of believing that out of the crucible of 1905 there will emerge a party of purity, of truth and of persuasion, that can confidently say to those who have contributed so much to its elevation to power, "We recognize that you helped us and we propose by our actions to merit said help and to prove our gratitude for it to the end that you may not leave us."

The proclamation has gone forth: "If you desire a boss knock not at our doors; if you desire to perpetuate graft in public places seek not favor at our hands. We are opposed to bossism; if bossism shall obtain graft is its necessary corollary." On that issue the battle is waged.

It is a question of honesty against dishonesty. It is a question of rectitude in public office against dereliction therein. Cox has created an oligarchy of crime; Herrick has fallen into the partisan plea of "God save the king;" and the king is Cox. I do not mean to intimate that republicans out of their partisanship are supporting this acclaim. They are not, but they are shouting with all the vigor of independence for a release from such serfdom. Democracy happens this year to open an avenue of escape, and as indicated above, democracy sincerely believes that after it has pointed the way and furnished the means it will have established the right to a continued confidence and will merit a continued support. The battle waged now in Philadelphia, that waged last year in Missouri, and that has stirred to the very cockles of its heart electorates of many cities and of every community, is waged in Ohio now. I believe that Buckeyedom is not insensible to a great moral wave, and therefore I predict, in the face of nominal absurdity, that John M. Pattison will be elected governor of Ohio on the 7th day of November.

I know that my prediction will come true, not through the assistance of those who are commanding the ships, but through the assistance of those who are behind the guns. The men of Ohio urged on, supported, cheered by her fair women, will see to it that what I have said is vindicated. All the prayers, all the hopes, all the better aspirations of men who speak, of those who write, of those who think, can not be attained unless that loyal band who stood for no less in 1896 stand true to their faith now.

The Bryan vote must be polled—and polled, the victory will be won.

MR. FORAKER AND THE RAILWAY RATE QUESTION

The editor of The Commoner recently received from a man of wide experience in railroad affairs an interesting letter bearing upon the railway rate question. This letter was not intended for publication, but the writer submitted some suggestions pertinent to the important subject under discussion. The subject was so ably handled in this letter that the privilege was asked and granted of using extracts from this letter. The following speaks for itself:

The lines are being drawn on the railroad rate regulation question, and Senator Foraker, in opening the republican campaign in Ohio on September 23 at Bellefontaine, throws down the gauge of battle to President Roosevelt in the following language:

"But it does not follow that to remedy these abuses (discrimination in rates) the rate-making power should be conferred on the interstate commerce commission, as the Ohio democratic platform of this year proposes. * * * To take control of the rate-making power is to take charge of the revenues of the roads, and that means that the government is to assume the responsibility not only of determining what rates shall be charged, but also of necessity, how much money a railroad shall be allowed to make, and thus determine, also of necessity, what improvements it shall be permitted to make, what extensions it may build, what equipment it must provide, what new tracks it may lay, and what kind of service it shall render."

Such language is to be expected from a railroad attorney, but what do the voters of Ohio think of Senator Foraker pleading the cause of the railroads? Every law defining and fixing the punishment for usury draws the line on the earning capacity of loaned money. Every state law fixing maximum rates for railroads draws the

line on rates that may be charged between points in the state. The right of the people to limit the charges of public service corporations of all kinds—street cars, electric and gas lighting companies, telephones, telegraph lines, etc., is inherent. This right has been exercised by the people in all countries and practically for all time. It is safe to say that every state in the union, either directly through its legislature, or through boards or commissions created for that purpose, has fixed a limit to rates that may be charged within its borders. That the people have imposed unreasonably low rates upon the railroads or any other public service corporation cannot be substantiated. The logical conclusion reached by following Senator Foraker's reasoning is that the people cannot be trusted to deal justly with the railroads, but that the railroads can always be trusted to deal justly with the people—a strange position for a public representative to assume. In fact the senator takes this position and says so in this way:

"They (the railroads) must not only make rates as low as justice to the railroads will allow, but they must make them interdependent, so that shippers can, with facility, send their products throughout the whole country."

The millenium is not here, and until railroads and other public service corporations "show us" we cannot take Senator Foraker's word for it. That the railroads do in some instances make rates as low, (or lower) as justice to the railroads will allow, is a well known fact. They have a habit of making unreasonably low rates to certain industries and localities, but they make up for it by exacting unreasonably high rates from others. Not being satisfied that certain rates for certain industries are low enough, and not being willing to quote a lower rate openly

as required by law, they cut the rate to favored ones by rebating and other illegal methods. Prior to the passage of the interstate commerce law the railroads would make a very low rate between two competitive points, and charge higher rates to intermediate point shippers for a shorter haul. The interstate commerce law prohibited this unfair and unreasonable practice, but the law was nullified by publishing one rate and charging another by rebating, etc. Now that the railroads are combining, pooling earnings, and eliminating competition by hook or crook, what are the people to do?

That the interstate commerce commission would deal unjustly with the railroads were the rate-making power conferred upon it is an unwarranted assumption. It is an insult to the intelligence and fairmindedness of the people.

The senator attempts to show how difficult rate-making is, as follows:

"The interstate commerce commission is composed of five very capable, upright gentlemen, who have rendered good service, but neither they nor any other similar body, acting as they must act, could satisfactorily discharge such a duty. The rate-making is probably the most complicated and difficult work connected with transportation. The railroads employ for this work the brightest and most skillful men they can find. * * * Their work is of scientific character. It can not be done except by experts."

To make rates as the railroads do certainly requires experts. Such work not only requires skill such as highwaymen employ, but there must also be an absence of conscience. Interstate rates are made, not as low as justice to the railroads will allow, but as high as the traffic will bear. Certain rates have to be made for certain com-

(Continued on Page 9)