

The Commoner

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 16, NO. 8

Lincoln, Nebraska, August, 1916

Whole Number 688

The Mother Argument

The strongest argument in favor of woman suffrage is the mother argument. I love my children—as much, I think, as a father can; but I am not in the same class with my wife. I do not put any father in the same class with the mother in love for the child. If you would know why the mother's love for a child is the sweetest, tenderest, most lasting thing in the world, you will find the explanation in the Bible: "Where your treasures are there will your heart be also." The child is the treasure of the mother; she invests her life in her child. When the mother of the Gracchi was asked: "Where are your jewels?" she pointed to her sons. The mother's life trembles in the balance at the child's birth, and for years it is the object of her constant care. She expends upon it her nervous force and energy; she endows it with the wealth of her love. She dreams of what it is to do and be—and, O, if a mother's dreams only came true, what a different world this world would be. The most pathetic struggle that this earth knows is not the struggle between armed men upon the battlefield; it is the struggle of a mother to save her child when wicked men set traps for it and lay snares for it. And as long as the ballot is given to those who conspire to rob the home of a child it is not fair—no one can believe it fair—to tie a mother's hands while she is trying to protect her home and save her child. If there is such a thing as justice, surely a mother has a just claim to a voice in shaping the environment that may determine whether her child will realize her hopes or bring her gray hairs in sorrow to the grave. Because God has planted in every human heart a sense of justice, and because the mother argument makes an irresistible appeal to this universal sense, it will finally batter down all opposition and open woman's pathway to the polls.

W. J. BRYAN.

A SUGGESTION BY MR. BRYAN

Mr. Bryan sent the following telegram suggesting the peace treaty plan for the settlement of the differences between the railroads and their employes in the present crisis:

August 14, 1916.

Messrs. Garretson, Stone, Carter and Lee, .
Railroad Brotherhood,
New York.

If it is found impossible to agree upon arbitration, I venture to suggest for your consideration the plan embodied in the new peace treaties between this nation and thirty other nations representing three-fourths of the population of the world. These treaties provide for investigation of all disputes before resorting to war, but reserve the right of independent action at the conclusion of the investigation. The fact that the commission's report is not binding on

DRYS WIN IN TEXAS

A Houston, Tex., dispatch, dated Aug. 7, says: The proposition to submit a constitutional amendment for state wide prohibition received a favorable majority of 1,784 votes in the July 22 Texas primary, according to the complete and official canvass of a sub-committee of the state democratic executive committee here today. The total was: for 173,069; against, 171,285.

the parties insures fairness. The commission on investigation provided for in the treaties is composed of five members, one appointed by each nation from among its own citizens, one appointed by each nation from a friendly nation and the fifth is agreed upon by the contracting parties.

In applying this plan to the present labor dispute, each side could appoint one member from among its own ranks and one member from the outside. The fifth member could be agreed upon by the parties or be selected by the President.

Pleading as justification for this suggestion my deep interest in the industrial situation and my earnest desire for an amicable settlement which will be just to all concerned, I am,

Very truly yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

MINISTER SULLIVAN

Instead of dealing with the entire diplomatic service, Mr. Hughes seizes upon one minor appointment, that of Mr. Sullivan to Santo Domingo, and makes it the basis of a sweeping attack against the entire service. If he will take the trouble to examine the recommendations, he will find that Mr. Sullivan's qualifications were certified to by the dean of the Yale law school. But Mr. Hughes has no trouble in overlooking a little matter like that when he wants to divert attention from the railroad question.

CONTENTS

THE MOTHER ARGUMENT
"DESERVING DEMOCRATS"
HUGHES'S SPEECHES
LEAVING IT TO THE EXPERTS
THE THIRTY PEACE TREATIES
THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
HUGHES WOULD HAVE RECOGNIZED
HUERTA
POPULAR ELECTION OF SENATORS
THE INCOME TAX AMENDMENT
IOWA DEMOCRACY'S VICTORY
A FINE LEGISLATIVE RECORD
DIGEST OF RURAL CREDITS ACT
HUGHES'S ACCEPTANCE SPEECH
WHAT WAR IS

"Deserving Democrats"

"Now that you have arrived and are acquainting yourself with the situation, can you let me know what positions you have at your disposal with which to reward deserving democrats? I do not know to what extent the knowledge of the Spanish language is necessary for employes. Let me know what is requisite, together with the salary, and when appointments are likely to be made."

The above is the letter which I wrote to Mr. Vick, the receiver of customs at San Domingo. Read it carefully. Scan each sentence, examine each word, each syllable. Mr. Hughes, once governor of New York, afterwards justice of the supreme court, and now republican candidate for President, thinks it important enough to quote in his campaign speeches. He is so indignant, so mortified, that he asks: "Should not every American hang his head in shame, that such a thing should occur in our highest department of government?"

I, alone, am responsible for that letter, and I am not ashamed of it. Attention is called to it, that I may expose the desperation of the man who has sought to use it as a means of advancing himself politically. The letter was written to an appointive officer, whose office WAS NOT UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE, and the inquiry was made in regard to offices which WERE NOT UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE. There was nothing in the letter to indicate a desire or intention to select men who were incompetent. On the contrary, inquiry is made as to "what is requisite." By what logic does Mr. Hughes reach the conclusion that "every American should hang his head in shame" because a democratic secretary of state expressed an interest in the appointment of deserving democrats to positions NOT UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE, for which such democrats were competent? Mr. Hughes had appointments to make when he was governor. Did he give those appointments to deserving republicans or to undeserving republicans? If to deserving republicans, did his action cause every citizen of New York to "hang his head in shame"? Or, is he so partisan that he regards it as entirely proper and patriotic to appoint deserving republicans and only shameful to appoint deserving democrats?

Mr. Hughes recognizes political obligations and has shown himself quite prompt in discharging such obligations. When he was a candidate for governor, he received the support of the railroads of New York and he generously paid the debt by vetoing the two-cent passenger rate bill. He does not describe that as shameful. When a candidate for governor, he received the support of the New York tax dodgers, the owners of "swollen fortunes," and he paid his debt by sending a message to the legislature protesting against the income tax amendment to the federal constitution. He does not describe that as shameful. He is now being supported by the