

# DISGUSTED DEMOCRATS REPUDIATE LEADER

Former Supporters of Bryan Assert  
Their Manhood and Quit the  
Continuous Office-Seeker.

Thousands of Bryanites Turn to Taft  
as the Campaign Nears the End—  
Neither the "Cleveland Democ-  
rats" Nor the Independent Voters  
Take Their Places and Bryan's  
Defeat Is Certain.

The thousands who formerly voted for Bryan, but who refuse to endorse that candidate's latest plea to be elected President, include thinking men of all occupations and conditions in life. They are now convinced that Bryan is too unstable and impractical to be entrusted in power. They like to hear him talk, but they tremble at the thought of him in the White House.

As the campaign has neared the finish the defections from the Democratic party in favor of Taft and Sherman have gained in volume and it has been easy to see the steady drift away from Bryan. With his old followers leaving him, the "Cleveland Democrats" still refusing to heed his advice, and the absolute failure to add new recruits to his cause, the chances of the Nebraskan for success have decreased steadily as Nov. 3 approached.

## The Fear of Bryan.

The fear that the election of Bryan will turn back the hands of the prosperity clock, no one knows how many years, is obvious all over the country and the feeling is shared by business men and laboring men alike.

Samuel Rosenthal of Baltimore, of the firm of Strouse & Brother, one of the largest clothing manufacturers in the country, has expressed the belief that the prosperity of the country and the steadiness of business depend on the election of Taft. Although a Democrat of many years' standing, Mr. Rosenthal says he will vote for the Republican candidate.

In Omaha a railroad man—one in the ranks—was listening to Bryan make one of his big campaign speeches. He stayed until Bryan began to attack Roosevelt and to ask "what has Roosevelt ever done?" The railroad man quit the meeting, procured a Taft badge and pinned it on his coat in place of a Bryan button, which he threw away. He said he had intended to vote for Bryan, but that Taft would get his ballot.

## Carliste Not for Bryan.

Some of the Bryanites have been predicting that John G. Carlisle would take a stand for the "Peoples," but so far their prophecies have failed and it is said by those who are close to that adroit and deft leader of sound government that he will vote for Taft.

Joseph B. Gill, Lieutenant Governor during the administration of John P. Altgeld as Governor of Illinois, and a lifelong Democrat, has announced that he will vote for William H. Taft. Mr. Gill, now a resident of California, registered at the Palmer House, Chicago, on his return from a visit to his old home at Murphysboro, where he still owns a daily Democratic newspaper. In the lobby he met Len Small of Kansas, field general of the Yates forces during the primary fight. "I have been a Democrat all my life," said Gill, "but I am going to vote for Taft. Why? Well, the reason is short and simple. Taft represents the true Roosevelt principle and Bryan represents almost anything for Bryan."

## An Incident from Nebraska.

Frank Currie of Gordon, Neb., formerly a State Representative, relates the following, which is extremely illuminating as regards conditions in "Bryan's own State":

"In my travels over Nebraska I have been able to find but one Republican who says he is going to vote for Bryan. Another little incident shows the way the wind is blowing. Recently at dinner twelve voters were seated. Eight had voted for Bryan in 1896 and four of the twelve had voted for him in 1900, but each and every one declared that this year they were going to vote for Taft. I thought for a minute they might be trying to string me, but after talking it over with them I saw they were all sincere in their convictions."

John W. Reynolds, a Confederate veteran, writing to the Baltimore American, says:

"It is true deplorable conditions exist through some parts of the country, but at the time Mr. Bryan was at the helm in Congress they existed everywhere. Ask the manufacturers, the mechanics and farmers and laborers of the country. It was the period that few have forgotten. Never will I, as a Southern man from the grand old State of North Carolina, four years in the service of the Confederacy fighting for a cause I believed to be right. If I live I shall cast my vote for the Hon. W. H. Taft and Sherman for the presidency and vice presidency."

## California Supporter Turns Away.

R. M. Hotaling of San Francisco, who has been a liberal contributor to Democratic campaign funds, refused to do so this campaign and announced he had come over to the Republican cause.

George B. Jones, former president of the Democratic Negro Jefferson Club of St. Louis, started his audience cheering at the meeting of the precinct organization of the Missouri Negro Republican League Club at 2549 Chestnut street, when he told why he left the Democratic ranks. He promised to try to induce the members of the Democratic organization to follow him.

Edward J. Maxwell of New York City, who has supported every candidate of the Democratic party since 1864, has come out in a long public

# THE READY RUNNER.



Copyright, 1908, by the Mall and Express Company.

## BRYAN AND FREE WOOL

Not Anxious to Raise Price of Wool  
for Benefit of Sheep Raisers.

But Would Lower Prices of Woolen  
Goods for Benefit of Wearers.

In 1894, while a member of the House of Representatives, Mr. Bryan wrote the following letter to a constituent:

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C., Feb. 6, 1894.  
Mr. V. Neaman, Oakland, Neb.

Dear Sir—Your favor at hand. I think you are right in saying that if we prohibited the use of shoddy, either directly or indirectly, it would increase the price of wool to some extent by increasing the demand for it, but it is an expedient always to do everything that the taxing power might be used for any such purpose. I am not so much interested in raising the price of wool which will only benefit those who raise sheep, as I am in lowering the price of woolen goods, which will benefit all those who wear them.

Yours truly,  
W. J. Bryan.

## Bryan's Sophistry Shown.

The American Sheep Breeder in a recent issue exposes the fallacy of the Bryan contention as follows:

Bryan's free wool sophistry is knocked in a cocked hat by facts and figures as far as the "dear public" is concerned. Mr. Bryan doesn't believe in building up a great national industry like the wool industry, at the expense of the general public. Really, how much does the dear public have to pay to maintain the wool industry of the United States? Let us get down to facts and figures. There are something like one million men engaged in growing wool, with about five hundred million dollars of capital invested, with an annual wool production of say from fifty to sixty million dollars. This figure is based on an average of 18 cents per pound for the wool grown. In addition to that, say fifteen million muttons are produced at a selling price of around sixty-five to seventy-five million dollars. A fair valuation of the annual production of wool and mutton would be one hundred and twenty-five million dollars. What the annual loss to this industry would be under a free wool regime is well known. Instead of the average of say 18 cents per pound (which is an extremely low figure for wool under ordinary times) and the average of about half that price for wool (on a free trade basis) would mean a loss to the wool grower of at least twenty-five million dollars per year. Wool growing in the West, under Cleveland's administration, ruined thousands of Rockmasters. Montana wools sold as low as seven and eight cents per pound under Cleveland. Two years ago these wools brought anywhere from eighteen to twenty-five cents per pound, and even higher figures for exceptional clips.

## Free Trade No Benefit to Consumer.

Now let us find out the cost of clothing, and the so-called saving to the consumer. For a spring suit of all-wool cloth, three and one-half yards of cloth are required. One yard of cloth weighs ten ounces. This would require a trifle over two pounds of wool. A fall suit requires three and one-half yards at fourteen ounces to the yard, or forty-nine ounces. The cost of clothing represents 85 per cent in labor and 15 per cent in material. The ordinary suit of clothing has 60 per cent of wool and the balance is shoddy and cotton. Suppose the tariff on wool were removed, that wool that had been averaging 18 cents per pound fell 50 per cent; the saving on a spring suit of clothing would be a trifle over twenty cents, providing the manufacturer and the retailer cut down the price of the garment to the extent of the reduced value of the wool caused by a removal

of the tariff. On a fall suit of clothing, based on the same figures and conditions, the cost would be reduced to the extent of say 27 cents or thereabouts. This means all-wool clothing, and does not take into consideration any shoddy or cotton, which everybody knows is used extensively in low-priced garments. As a matter of fact all woolen clothing, or clothing made out of a mixture of wool, cotton and shoddy, never has, and never will, be sold to the consumer for one penny less under free wool conditions. Every school boy knows that the cost of his clothing under Cleveland's free wool reign was not one cent reduced by the removal of the tariff. Any reduction in the cost of wool used in the manufacture of an ordinary suit of clothing would be so infinitesimal that any manufacturer, jobber, wholesaler or retailer would laugh at the idea of the public saving anything by the removal of the tariff on wool. It is the veriest nonsense to consider this proposition for one moment. We have, for our own satisfaction, reduced the possible cost of all the woolen clothing used in the United States for one year, providing the selling value of the goods were reduced to the extent of the reduction in the price of wool, and it reaches such a small figure that it is not worth mentioning. Everyone knows that our manufacturers have to import about twice the amount of wool we grow in this country. Under ordinary business conditions the tariff on wool has kept the price up to a fair measure of profit for the grower. No, gentlemen, we want no Bryan and free wool.

If Bryan Should Be Elected.  
(From the Philadelphia Ledger, Ind.)

Two letters have been received from readers who touch on the intensely practical aspects of the campaign. A business man wishes to know what, in all human probability, would become of business and of our wanted and desired prosperity if, perchance Bryan and a Bryan administration should be chosen, and a blunt, intelligent workman, whose letter is a "lot of blather" in politics, and he would like to know what the ordinary skilled workman is to "get" if Bryan is elected and "what Taft has to offer."

Those two inquiries embody a large part of the pertinent question for the mass of the nation, and the gist of the answer may be given in a few words: If Taft be elected there will be rest, recuperation, confidence and prosperity; if Bryan be elected there will be acute danger of unrest, lack of confidence and uncertainty at least for a long time, and the probability of a prolongation of resuscitation of that stagnation from which the country is now by slow, labored and painful effort beginning to recover.

The country is just beginning to recover from the industrial paralysis. The crops are passing fair; the people of the nation are rich; our institutions are all sound; every known factor and material influence concerned in the return of immediate, abounding, astounding activity and prosperity is present save only—complete restoration of confidence. The only known or conceivable influence which acts to retard manufacturing and general industrial operations and the full employment of all workers at this time is the lingering political unrest and the knowledge that a presidential campaign must be held before the atmosphere is finally cleared, so that "cowardly capital" will trust its head forth again from its safe deposit caves.

## Injunctions Restrain Capital.

"I am against those guerillas who would destroy this most vital writ of conscience. The court of equity is the keeper of the people's conscience and the writ of injunction is its most valuable power. It prevents the digging of a ditch that will damage adjacent property; compels railroads to furnish cars. It stays the hands of lawless corporations from committing acts, which once done would work an injury that could not be amended. Under the plan of the opposition you take the bridge off for lawless wealth and bid it run wild. Scores more of injunctions have been issued against capital than against labor. Name me one and I will name you at least 100 against capital."

—Senator Albert J. Beveridge.

# REPUBLICAN PLAN RATIONAL.

Noted Financial Expert Advises  
Against Inconsidered Action.

All Classes Interested in Establishing  
Sound Banking System.

Victor Morawetz, recognized as an expert upon financial and economic questions, says the Bryan bank deposit guarantee plan would encourage "wildcat" banking. These are excerpts from a recent article written on the subject by Mr. Morawetz:

If it were true that the adoption of this plan would make all deposits in national banks equally safe and thereby would inspire confidence in all national bank deposits, as Mr. Bryan claims, the plan would prove a direct encouragement to "wildcat" banking and would prove disastrous in the long run. It would enable speculators or inexperienced persons to form a bank with small capital and to obtain large deposits on the strength of the guaranty, by offering higher rates of interest to depositors than a conservatively managed bank could afford to pay; and they could then use these deposits in promoting speculative or unsound ventures. They would only risk the loss of the small capital which they contributed and their individual liability for an equal amount. If their speculations should succeed, they would reap large profits, but if their speculations should fail and the money obtained from depositors be wasted, the sound banks would have to bear the loss.

## Republican Plan Rational.

The Republican party proposes to deal with this banking question in a rational, conservative manner. Having regard to the difference between savings deposits and those commercial deposit liabilities which are merely bank credits created as a means of carrying on the business of the country, the Republican party proposes to establish a system of postal savings banks so that the people everywhere throughout the country can deposit their savings with absolute safety. A proposal has also been made, and, no doubt, will be considered by Congress, of authorizing the national banks to establish savings departments to be managed, under the supervision of the Comptroller of the Currency, according to the most approved methods of managing savings banks.

The Republican party recognizes that the United States should have the soundest and safest system of banking and currency that can be devised, and to that end a Republican Congress has appointed a national commission, consisting of Senators and Representatives of both the political parties. That commission is now considering the subject of a national currency.

Public hearings will make recommendations to Congress at the earliest opportunity.

## All Classes Equally Interested.

All classes of the people and all sections of the country are equally interested in establishing our system of banking and currency upon the soundest possible basis. The welfare of the entire country depends upon a sound and practical system of banking and currency, and the only patriotic course is to eliminate all party feeling and politics from the consideration of this great subject. We know that the present system is not perfect and should be improved, but we know also that we have prospered under this system and that there is no such pressing need for a change as to warrant hasty or ill-considered action. This plan of guaranteeing bank deposits undoubtedly will be considered with the utmost care by the National Monetary Commission, and if the plan can stand careful analysis and scrutiny, it will be adopted by Congress whether the government be controlled by Republicans or Democrats. But it would be wrong—incalculably wrong—to treat this great and difficult question of finance as a question of party politics, to be dealt with by popular vote in the heat of a presidential campaign. Surely the American people will not make this far-reaching change in their banking system and try this dangerous experiment, upon the recommendation of the Democratic party and of a leader who, twelve years ago, and again eight years ago, urged the adoption of the worst financial fallacy of the age, and, if his counsels had prevailed, would have plunged the whole country into disaster and shame.

## Bryan's Denunciation of Hughes.

About this time in a presidential contest partisan speakers run emptying. As a melancholy instance of this behold Mr. Bryan denouncing Gov. Hughes as the broker of trusts! No man in American life is more clearly entitled to credit as the defender of the rights of the people than the governor of the Empire state. He is a reformer who has achieved results without talking everybody to death. It may be added that the voter who wants to get at the real fact in the closing weeks of such a contest as is now in progress, when each side is busy misrepresenting the other, must dig them out for himself—and very often, too, the aforesaid voter is led and to do it!—Springfield Republican.

## Cannot Risk Bryanism.

The American people cannot afford to risk the government in the hands of a political schemer and a professional faker, one who is constantly hunting for some stalking horse on which to ride into power. Naturally the conservative, sensible voter turns in disgust from Mr. Bryan to the cautious, self-possessed, wise statesman, William H. Taft, who is a pillar of national strength.—Senator William O. Bradley of Kentucky.

## THE SUPREME COURT.

Choice of President Will Involve  
Far-Reaching Consequences.  
(From Gov. Hughes' Youngstown  
speech.)

"Not only will the coming election directly affect the executive branch of the government, but it is most important in its relation to the judicial branch. Rarely has the choice of President involved more far-reaching consequences, for it is not improbable that the next President will appoint at least four judges of the United States Supreme Court. Upon these appointments will largely depend the quality of the judicial work of this great court for years to come. Congress may pass laws, but the Supreme Court interprets and construes them and determines their validity. The Constitution, with its guarantees of liberty and its grants of Federal power, is finally what the Supreme Court determines it to mean. Upon the learning, wisdom and character of the judges of the Supreme Court rests not merely the just determination of the important matters of private right which come before that august tribunal, but to a very large degree the course of our political history and the development and security of our institutions. In view of the vacancies which in the natural course of events will most probably occur during the next few years we must remember that we are about to choose a representative of the people to whom is confided the nomination of Federal judges, a power second to none possessed by the President, the exercise of which calls for the highest judgment. If we should search the country for a delegate of the people who could be confidently intrusted with this important duty it is probable that no one could command higher confidence than the Republican candidate for President. Himself a judge, learned in the wisdom of the law, he commanded the respect and esteem of the entire bar of the country, without regard to partisan division. By litigants and lawyers alike it was felt that when he left his important place upon the Circuit Court of Appeals to undertake his difficult duties in the Philippines, the judicial branch of the government had sustained a most serious loss. And he has long been regarded as one in every way worthy to succeed the present chief justice of the United States. With his fairness and acumen, with his wide knowledge of the bar from which the judges must be recruited, with his broadmindedness and democratic sympathy and his keen interest in all that pertains to the welfare of the people, we may be assured that if he is selected to perform this duty the interests of the country will be impartially and wisely safeguarded in its discharge."

## MISSIONARIES CAPABLE.

Taft Speaks Well of Mission Work  
in Orient.

Reference to the recent flattering interview about Mr. Taft by Bishop Bashford of the M. E. Church in China led the candidate into a talk of missions. He referred to a book written by Dr. G. E. Morrison, of the London Times, in which the missionaries are criticized as not being of real use, and slighting reference is made to "rice Christians." These, as Mr. Taft explained, are the natives who are said to pretend to become converts only to enjoy the bounty of the missions.

"My own observations in the Orient," said Mr. Taft, "lead me to believe that Dr. Morrison's criticisms are not justified. The missions are the outposts of our western civilization in China and the other Oriental countries, and I have found the missionaries an earnest and capable lot of people. It was because of my observations of the good done by them in the East that our government established clubs on the Isthmus of Panama, and put Y. M. C. A. secretaries in charge. We also employed seven preachers, Protestant and Catholic, who have built up churches. There are perhaps 10,000 white people and 10,000 others brought from the West Indies in the canal zone. It was absolutely necessary that something of this kind be done to prevent the pernicious effects of vice, which grows luxuriantly there if not checked."—New York World.

## What New Bryanism Means.

Reduced down to its final analysis, this new Bryanism is the most dangerous fallacy that he has yet advocated. His main argument is that the state and the national government exact of bankers security for public funds, and therefore that the ordinary depositor should be likewise secured. The plain answer is, an individual depositor has the same right as the government to require security for his deposits, but neither the government nor the depositor has any right to require one bank to guarantee a deposit in another bank.—Oscar S. Straus, Secretary Department of Commerce and Labor.

Taft, 1908; Hughes, 1912.

To the Editor of the New York World: I was not for Taft at first, but now I am. Bryan's election means continuance of the hard times that we are now having. Taft's election means the return of prosperity. I shall vote for Taft, Sherman and Slomp, hoping to vote for Hughes in 1912.—T. S. Reddix, Saltville, Va., Oct. 8.

"Anything that makes capital idle, or which reduces or destroys it, must reduce both wages and the opportunity to earn wages."—Mr. Taft, at Cooper Union, New York City.