

railroads of the United States and he expects to pay them back by aiding them to escape state legislation, and find a haven of security in "exclusive federal control" over the railroads; he is being supported by the shipping trust and expects to pay them back by helping them to prevent government competition; he is supported by the tariff barons and expects to pay them back by enabling them to collect tribute from the consumers, through high tariff rates; he is supported by the trust magnates and expects to pay them back by shielding them from punishment for the extortion which they desire to practise; he is supported by Wall street and expects to pay them back by turning over to them our financial system; he is supported by those who are exploiting Mexico and he expects to pay them back by spending American blood and squandering money raised by taxation, in order to guarantee profits on speculative investments. And yet, with the record which he has made in paying his political obligations at the expense of the public and with the pledges his speeches contain to those who are now aiding his ambitions, he has the impudence to hold up for criticism a legitimate effort to reward competent men for the service which they have rendered to the cause of reform.

For twenty years the people have been engaged in a life and death struggle to save the nation from the big exploiters, the big "grafters" and the big "pork" hunters — from the plunder bund, to which Mr. Hughes is indebted for all the political honors he has enjoyed and which is now seeking to put him in a position to safeguard plutocracy from further attacks. Mr. Hughes is perfectly familiar with the contest, because he has been conspicuous among the champions of that plunderbund. In the campaign of 1908 he was put forth as the chief representative of the trusts, and his eloquent advocacy of their cause won him a place on the supreme bench, where he was quick to show his bias in their favor. But while he has been winning valuable rewards as a republican, who is "deserving" from the standpoint of the predatory interests, the plain, common people have been waging a brave and continuous struggle for the rescue of their government from the hands of Mr. Hughes's political friends and supporters, and they have won battle after battle.

They have secured, without Mr. Hughes's aid, the election of senators by the people, thus putting the senate in touch with the voters. They have won, in spite of Mr. Hughes's opposition, an income tax amendment to the constitution, which has made it possible to transfer a considerable part of the burden of taxation from consumption to incomes. They have secured a reduction of the tariff and a measure of relief from the exactions of the trusts. They have secured currency reform, a rural credit law, a child labor law, and other measures of justice to agriculture, labor and commerce, and they have made their fight at great sacrifice to themselves, and in the face of intimidation, coercion, and ostracism. They have shown a moral courage and a devotion worthy of the great cause in which they have enlisted.

I received the support of nearly six millions and a half of these voters in three campaigns. I would be unworthy of the affection they have shown and the confidence they have manifested, as well as of the support they have given, if I were willing to admit that a republican is necessarily superior to them either in patriotism or capacity. I would be unworthy of their loyal friendship if I did not welcome every opportunity to reward them by aiding them to secure any appointive offices, outside of the civil service, for which they were competent.

As an official, I enforced the civil service law to the letter, and upon my resignation, received from the employes of the state department, more than 90 per cent of whom were under the civil service, a watch which I prize as a priceless treasure. But, while I observed the civil service law, wherever it was in force, I felt myself free to aid in rewarding deserving democrats, wherever it could be done without detriment to the service. My regret is that I was able to reward so few of the multitude who are deserving, measured by their political service, by their capacity and by their fitness for the work to be done.

In a republic, where the government is good only when the people are willing to undertake the labor necessary to make it good, political zeal and willingness to spend time and money in behalf of remedial legislation can never be a legitimate objection to political appointment. Those who can raise campaign funds by mortgaging the government in advance to the bene-

“I”

“I am,” “I shall,” “I intend,” “I propose”—these are the phrases upon which Candidate Hughes bases his campaign speeches. Others have done wrong, but he never will; others have made mistakes, but he can not err; others have caused him to blush—he seemingly has spent most of his time blushing. He has blushed for Mexico, he has blushed for the diplomatic service, he has blushed for incompetency, he has blushed for extravagance, he has blushed for log-rolling, he has blushed for the pork-barrel, but in all of his blushing, he has blushed most deeply because of the “You kiss me and I’ll kiss you” policy in congress. He is going to stop it all! He has added to the republican platform two paramount planks—“I am the only perfect One!” and “God, I thank Thee that I am not as other men.”

The above is a short epitome of Mr. Hughes’s appeal to the voters—“I am,” “I shall,” “I intend,” “I propose.”

“I”

ficiaries of privilege may scorn the labors of the unselfish, the unpurchasable, and the unfrightened political workers, but those whose only appeal is to the conscience and patriotism of the masses will not hang their heads in shame at any legitimate effort that may be made to introduce into government employment those who combine a heart interest with the service rendered by brain and hand. The “deserving democrat” is not to be despised—he is as much entitled to recognition as a “deserving republican,”—and both democrats and republicans are deserving in proportion as they honestly endeavor to make our government a government “of the people, by the people, and for the people,” and insure its administration, according to the maxim “equal rights to all and special privileges to none.”

W. J. BRYAN.

MR. HUGHES' CAMPAIGN TOUR

The republican papers regarded campaign tours by a presidential candidate as very undignified twenty years ago when Mr. Bryan went before the people. It is, however, a perfectly dignified thing now when an ex-supreme court justice does it. Why this change? Possibly, it is due to the fact that passes have been abolished so that the railroads can not take excursions to the “front porch” as they did in 1896.

How mild and dignified Mr. Bryan's campaign speeches sound when compared with the ravings of Candidate Hughes! It really shocks one to see how the level of political discussion has been lowered since it has taken on a judicial tone.

The republican papers announce in big headlines that “Hughes has come out against graft.” Now, if the President comes out FOR graft the issue will have to be fought out.

WHICH PARTY LEADS?

At Butte Mr. Hughes said: “The democratic party has always been a party of opposition to progress. There has not been a great national movement in response to a national demand that has not had to run over the prostrate form of the democratic party.”

What do you think of that from a reactionary leader of a reactionary party? Where was Mr. Hughes when the democratic party led the fight for popular election of senators? Where was Mr. Hughes when the democrats led the fight for an income tax? Where was he when the democrats led the fight for currency reform and for anti-trust legislation? For twenty years the democratic party has led the reform forces of the nation, and the republican leaders have done their best to prevent reforms. Mr. Hughes has not been in a Rip Van Winkle sleep, either—HE HAS BEEN ON THE SIDE OF WALL STREET ALL THE TIME.

W. J. BRYAN.

Hughes's Speeches

Mr. Hughes's speech of acceptance and his first campaign speech are now before the public.

As no justice of the supreme court was ever nominated for president before, Mr. Hughes is setting a precedent. He is showing us how, in his opinion, experience on the supreme bench should fit one for the political arena. He has answered one of the democratic arguments—the only one he has attempted to. The democrats protested against a nominee being taken from the supreme court. After reading Mr. Hughes's speeches, the country will be convinced that his partisan bias is better suited to a political campaign than to a position which requires a judicial temperament.

It will be a surprise to the country that a justice of the supreme court should be able to accumulate so much vitriol in so short a term of service. A comparison of his speeches with the speeches made by other men who have been candidates will show that none of them, not even Roosevelt, have been more partisan or unfair in their attacks on an occupant of the White house.

Candidate Hughes is as uncandid in the defining of his own position as he is lacking in frankness in the assaults he makes on the President's position.

He indorses the platform of his party, which demands congressional legislation (and a federal amendment if necessary) taking from the states all authority over railroads, and vesting this authority exclusively in the federal government. This is revolutionary, and means nothing less than depriving the states of all the power they now have to protect the people from railroad extortion. Mr. Hughes deals with the railroad question in a few carefully chosen words, which can be construed as an indorsement of the platform by the railroad magnates, who put that plank in, but his language gives the general public no intimation of the railroad plot which he indorses.

Likewise, in discussing the merchant marine, he takes the side of the shipping trust against the shipping bill, and yet he does not explain the republican plan which not only protects the shipping trust from government competition, but contemplates subsidies paid from the public treasury.

He takes the side of the tariff barons against the consumers, and gives no assurance that he will favor retention of the income taxes, which impose on those possessing large incomes a part of the burden that the republican party collected from consumption, through tariff duties.

Mr. Hughes seemingly demands the expenditure of more money on preparedness than the democratic administration recommends, and yet he does not explain where the money is to come from, or what method is to be employed in raising the larger sum which his policy would require.

The fact that, as governor, he sent a message to the legislature, protesting against the ratification of the income tax amendment shows his position on this subject. The fact that he joined the rest of the court in holding the law constitutional did not indicate any change in opinion as to the policy of the income tax. He could not deny the constitutionality of the law, however much he might oppose it as a fiscal policy.

In his speech of acceptance, he intimates that the trust question has been settled, and yet he not only did nothing to secure relief from the trusts, but he fails to concede the merit of the laws passed without his aid; and he will have, in this campaign, the support of all the trust magnates. It was Perkins, for instance, who is connected with both the Steel trust and the Harvester trust, who secured for Mr. Hughes the indorsement of the progressive committee.

In the Mexican matter, Mr. Hughes has been grossly unfair, as well as lacking in straightforwardness. As he has taken the part of the exploiters in dealing with the tariff question, the trust question, the railroad question and the shipping question, so he is taking the part of the exploiters in dealing with Mexico.

He would have had this nation recognize Huerta, who secured his position by an act of high treason, took the former president captive by force and then allowed, if he did not cause, him to be put to death. He ruled Mexico with an iron hand, absorbing by arbitrary decree the legislative power of the congress which he overthrew. To have recognized Huerta would have been to set a premium on treason and assassination, and to do so in the interest of exploiters,