

complete and abject surrender of those who made the fight in 1896 and in 1900. And this surrender is not confined to the party's position on the money question. It means that the party must stop its opposition to the demands of organized wealth on all questions, must nominate a ticket composed of men who are in the confidence of the money magnates and the trust magnates, and then allow the party to be so organized that it can collect an enormous campaign fund from the men who are enjoying special privileges and immunities at the hands of the government. Reorganizers do not stand for any real or positive reform.

This is the harmony program, and there is no reason why any true believer in democratic principles should be deceived by it. If the men who talk about harmony so much really want harmony, why do they not content themselves with contributing their mite toward democratic success? Certainly those who helped to defeat the party, if they realize the gravity of their offence, will be ashamed to ask for leadership, and those who are not restrained by a sense of propriety can hardly be trusted with the reins.

The voters who in 1896 and 1900 risked social and business ostracism are perfectly willing to welcome back and forgive those who went astray, provided those who return come back changed in sentiment and purpose. But why welcome men whose only object in coming back is to make the democratic party an adjunct and an aid to the republican party? Why have a fight in the convention if it is going to result in renewed alienation unless the party sounds a retreat? Instead of inviting harmony these so-called "harmonizers" are only planning for more contention.

Mr. Bryan's views and conduct affect only himself and those who choose to be influenced by what he says or does, but he can no more shirk his responsibility, be it great or little, than other democrats can. Every democrat owes a duty to himself, to his party and to his country, to contend for those things which he believes to be best. If Mr. Bryan could relieve himself from this responsibility merely because those who have opposed him would be gratified by his silence, then democrats might, with the same logic, be urged to cease contending for democratic principles because their silence would gratify the republicans. If Mr. Bryan, with his knowledge of the plans and purposes of the reorganizers, refrained from pointing out their menace to the party's welfare, he could justly be accused of anostacy or cowardice. Who is under greater obligation than he to the democrats who were loyal in both campaigns? The fact that he is not a candidate for any office makes it more imperative rather than less that he should do a citizen's part in the discussion of public questions and in the plans proposed for making democratic principles effective. What would be thought of a neighbor who failed to give notice of an attempted burglary merely for fear of disturbing the quietude of a neighborhood? The leaders among the reorganizers are making a burglarious attempt to enter the democratic party for the purpose of carrying away whatever it has of value to those who occupy the house, and it is time to sound the alarm.

If any real democrat is deceived he has himself to blame, for the admissions of the reorganizers are sufficient to put all on their guard.

Let us have harmony; not the harmony that would enable the wolf to enter the lamb fold unnoticed, but a real harmony between those who believe in a government of the people, by the people and for the people, administered according to the doctrine of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none"—a government which would protect the people from every arm uplifted for their injury. No other harmony is either desirable or possible, and harmony banquets that are designed to obliterate the distinctions between democracy and plutocracy can only bring evil, however well intended.

## The Logical Candidate.

When a few months ago it was stated that Grover Cleveland was the conspicuous advisor of the reorganizers, other representatives of that element denied the charge.

When it was suggested by the editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal that Mr. Cleveland was ambitious to become the democratic nominee in 1904, the statement was greeted with general laughter. Yet today we find some of the representatives of these reorganizers actually booming Mr. Cleveland for the nomination.

A Washington dispatch to the Sioux City Tribune, under date of March 19, says that "two weeks ago politicians here talked Judge Parker of New York for a democratic candidate. Now, as if by magic, Cleveland's name is on all democratic

tongues." In the same dispatch it is said that this political change "has developed with astonishing rapidity throughout the east within the last few days;" and it is said that "something nearly approaching a serious demand that Cleveland be the candidate for president next year," is very noticeable. It is added that "Mr. Cleveland has yielded to the extent of agreeing to make an extensive tour of the west in April and May." It is further explained that "the demand for consideration of Cleveland was voiced by the New York World, now the sanest democratic newspaper published in the east."

The World in a conspicuous editorial undertakes to show "why Cleveland is strong." The World says that "it did not require the news of Mr. Cleveland's projected tour of the west to keep alive or to stimulate public interest in the possibility of his nomination by the democrats for the presidency."

The World reminds its readers that on February 21 it presented "a number of reasons for thinking that as issues and events are now shaping it is premature and illogical to reckon Mr. Cleveland out of the race." The World maintains that the third term objection to Mr. Cleveland is "not strictly relevant." It thinks that the fact that there would be an interval of eight years, with two other presidents of the opposite party intervening would remove the third term objection. It thinks that the enemies Mr. Cleveland has made are not really worthy of consideration because his first election was greatly aided by the "enemies he has made." The World thinks that Mr. Cleveland's refusal to support the democratic ticket during the last two presidential campaigns is not material because in that refusal "he had the company of a million democrats more or less."

The World adds:

"The whole question resolves itself into this: What other democrat is as strong as Grover Cleveland? What other candidate could command so many republican and independent votes in the great pivotal states that are absolutely essential to democratic success? What other democrat ever did get so many votes outside his party in these states as Cleveland did in 1892, when he carried not only New York, New Jersey and Connecticut, but Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, California, and got one electoral vote in Ohio, so narrow was the margin there."

In spite of all the objections that have been urged, the World concludes that Mr. Cleveland is "the logical candidate and the strongest candidate of his party."

It is hardly necessary to engage in a discussion as to the claims of this man upon a democratic nomination. Democrats might be quite willing to forget that, after very nearly wrecking the democratic party in his second administration, Mr. Cleveland deserted that party in 1896 and in 1900 and gave whatever power and influence he possessed to the aid of the republican party; but it will be a bit more difficult for them to forget Mr. Cleveland's undemocratic record in the White house during his second term.

The World seems to think that the south may be depended upon to cast its vote solidly for Mr. Cleveland and that the objections to him in western states are not worthy of consideration. It says that these states are republican and that even though a million democrats should oppose Mr. Cleveland in hopelessly republican states, "it would make no difference in the result."

What assurance has the World that it can persuade democrats even in states that are not hopelessly republican to go to the polls and vote for a man whose bond deals and other engagements with Wall street, whose plain contempt for the interests of his party and whose open disregard for the welfare of the country were vigorously denounced even by the New York World itself?

It is little short of amazing that these editors and politicians who assume to themselves a monopoly on political sagacity, as well as upon political virtue, should close their eyes to the fact that in the presence of the great evils under which the American people are suffering, men are studying public questions and are crying not merely for victory for a particular party, but crying for actual and practical relief.

What a magnificent spectacle the democratic party would present with Grover Cleveland as its standard-bearer in 1904; and yet if the democratic party is to stand for things which the reorganizers hope the party will stand for, if the democratic party is to be reorganized for the benefit of the trust magnates, then Grover Cleveland is, indeed, the logical candidate.

If the democratic party is to be asked to re-

wise its platform, to choose its candidate according to the pleasure of men among whom Mr. Cleveland is a conspicuous advisor, then it will be far better that Mr. Cleveland himself be the candidate of this element. Under such circumstances, no one need be deceived. Democrats to their great sorrow know the man. They are familiar with his record. They have every reason to know the course he would pursue should he be elected for a third term; and if in the light of all this knowledge he was permitted to become the party nominee democrats would have only themselves to blame for the result.

The democratic party, pretending to wage war against special interests, with Grover Cleveland as its candidate!

The American people, struggling under the enormous burdens that have been placed upon them through the greed and avarice of trust magnates, turning for relief to a Grover Cleveland administration!

What an inspiring spectacle, indeed, for sincere and conscientious men! What a magnificent result for the contemplation of those who struggle for the destruction of special interests and who hope for the restoration of popular government!

## The Aldrich Bill.

In order that the readers of The Commoner may know what to expect from the republican party when congress meets in December, the Aldrich bill is printed in full on another page. It was called up near the close of the last session of congress, but there was not time enough to force it through. It will be noticed that the secretary of the treasury designates whatever national banking associations he likes as depositories of public money, and that they are to be employed "as fiscal agents of the government, performing whatever reasonable duties may be required of them." In these designated depositories the secretary may deposit public moneys received from all sources, and may accept as security any of the interest-bearing obligations of the United States or of any state, also municipal bonds of any city of 5,000 inhabitants, provided the city has been in existence twenty-five years, has not for ten years defaulted in the payment of interest and whose indebtedness does not exceed 20 per cent of the value of the taxable property. It is also provided that first mortgage railroad bonds may be used as security for such deposits, provided the road has paid not less than 4 per cent per annum on its entire capital stock for a period of not less than ten years. The banks are to pay a rate of interest to be fixed by the secretary, amounting to not less than 1½ per cent and the United States is to have a general lien on all the assets of the bank, in addition to the special security above named.

The objections urged against this bill range themselves under four heads. The first objection was very forcibly stated by Senator Blackburn in reply to Senator Bailey. The senator from Texas made a speech in favor of the Aldrich bill. He said that while he was opposed to the collection of unnecessary revenue, he thought it better to deposit the money in the banks, and thus return it to circulation, than to lock it up in the vaults. He estimated the amount thus to be deposited at \$300,000,000; he not only favored depositing the money with the banks, but he objected to the charging of interest. He said: "Another provision in this bill that I would prefer to have stricken out, is the provision for interest. I believe that it would be better to avoid the question about the government loaning money as contradistinguished from depositing it." He also objected to the provision giving the government a general lien on deposits, saying: "There is an amendment reported by the committee to which I object. It is the provision that gives the government a first lien upon the assets of the bank as against all other depositors. The government takes a special security for its deposit, and the power of the secretary of the treasury to demand more security is ample if what he has becomes imperilled." He was at first inclined to object to the deposit of railroad bonds as security, but says that the objection was more sentimental than substantial.

These quotations are made to show Mr. Bailey's attitude upon the subject, and to give a better understanding of Mr. Blackburn's answer. The readers of the Congressional Record will be impressed with the feeling that Mr. Bailey's argument lacked the force and logic that usually characterizes his speeches. Mr. Blackburn in making his reply was frequently interrupted by Mr. Aldrich and Mr. Stewart, and other republicans, but he held his ground against them, and