

I announced that I would be a candidate if the democrats desired it. I said that I would obey the party if it summoned me and would, if the party wished, carry the standard no matter whom the republicans might nominate and no matter whether the chances favored victory or defeat. That is my position today.

If I have retained your confidence it is because I have spoken from my heart to your hearts and have cherished the same ideals that you have cherished.

If I am nominated I want the nomination to come from the voters rather than from the convention. The convention is but the servant of the voters—the voters are the masters. They have a right to determine both the platform and the candidates. If you want me nominated, instruct for me. Instructions are democratic. No one has any right to represent others unless they want him to represent them.

I believe in instruction. I do not care upon whom your choice falls. Whoever he is he should have delegates instructed by the people who elected them. They should represent the wishes of the people.

If I am to be your candidate I want your delegates instructed for me. If I am your candidate again it will be in answer to a call from the party, and upon that condition only am I a candidate. If the voters of the party want me for their candidate they will instruct their delegates to that effect.

And there is more needed than instructions. The delegates should be men who are willing to be instructed. They should be men willing to carry out the instructions which the people give them.

I do not want delegates instructed for me, but complaining of their instructions. I do not want delegates who will spend their time at the convention explaining that they would like to be free and that they consider it impossible to elect the man whom they are instructed to nominate. I am perfectly willing to fight all the enemies that can get in front of me, but my enemies shall not get behind me again. I say this of myself, but it holds good for any candidate whom you may wish to nominate. If you prefer another candidate then those who prefer me should not ask to be a part of the convention which nominates him. The delegates should act as the representatives of the people, and they should be men who are willing to do what they have been instructed to do. If you want me to be your candidate let no man who does not want to see me nominated represent you in the convention. Let no man have a seat there who does not want to see me elected if nominated. Let the candidate who has the support of the people have the heart as well as the voice of the delegates. And again, if I am nominated, it will come at the end of twelve years of fighting in the open. My views are known to all the people. They have been openly voiced and I have a right to assume that the people who nominate me will give me the kind of platform on which I can stand and fight. I have the right to expect that if I be nominated, the platform of the party will be one for which I shall not have to apologize. It should be one on which I can make the campaign. It should be one which will enable me to make an honest fight in the open for the principles for which the people know I stand, and without evasion. Then there is another thing. If I am nominated, and given a platform on which I can stand and fight, I have a right to assume that the party will place the management of the campaign in the hands of men who want to see me elected. I have the right to assume that the committee in charge of the campaign will be willing to devote their time to winning a victory. In 1896 I made a campaign when some members of the committee would not attend my meetings. I shall not make another campaign with bushwhackers in the organization. If I am nominated there will not be any misunderstanding as to the kind of fight I shall make. The views I stand for and the kind of a fight I make are too well known for there to be any doubt. Those who do not want that kind of a fight do not want me nominated. They do not want me elected. If they do not want me elected they should give their support to another candidate. If they are not for the kind of a fight I shall make they must get another man. The man and the fight must agree. If I am nominated it will be because the people are for the principles for which I stand and not because they are for me personally. I am not vain enough to believe that six and a half million of voters will turn out and work indefatigably for me just to satisfy my personal ambitions.

You are interested in me because you are interested in yourselves, because you are interested in your children and your children's children. You are interested in me because I believe in the kind of government you love. I would rather be the leader of six and a half million democrats who think for themselves and march with me only when I march in the direction in which they want me to march than be the leader of six and a half millions without thoughts who would simply echo what someone else said.

The democrats have been thinking for themselves and they have been studying public questions from the standpoint of the many. They have been considering the rights of all the people rather than the privileges of a few. There is no doubt that a large majority of the people believe in Democratic principles and are ready to try the policies that our party has been advocating. The nation's conscience is awakened; let us appeal to it with an honest platform; with an honest organization and with honest methods, and our appeal will not be in vain.



WILL THE BANKS ANSWER THIS?

In addition to the arguments already presented by The Commoner in favor of the guaranteed bank, the following is submitted:

The United States government requires a deposit of specific security when it deposits money in a national bank; the state also requires security as a rule, and the county and city deposits are secured either by bonds or by the deposit of specific securities.

Now the question arises, if the United States government which can at any time inspect a bank and find out just what it is doing and how its business is being conducted, requires security for its deposits, why should not security be given to the depositor who can not examine for himself and does not know anything about the bank's solvency or methods? And loss to the national government, to the state, to the county or to the city would be borne by all the people and thus be small upon each one, while the loss to the individual has to be borne entirely by himself and may wipe out his entire savings. Is not the argument stronger in favor of the protection of depositors than it is in favor of the protection of the nation, the state, the county or the city?

But the case is even stronger when the bank is required to put up specific security for the protection of national, state, county, or city deposits. Its gilt-edged securities are thus hypothecated and the inferior securities are left for the security of the depositors, so that as a matter of fact, the public deposits are not only protected, but they are protected at the expense of the individual depositors. What shall we say of a national bank which willingly gives the government specific security and then opposes the protection of depositors? And, strange to say, these big banks that get the big deposits from the government upon specific security are the very ones that have fought and are fighting the system for the guaranty of depositors. It is time that the depositors understood the situation and got together for their own protection. Will any banker who is opposing the guaranty system answer this argument and explain why it is right to protect government deposits and wrong to protect individual deposits?



A GOOD IDEA

Congressman Hitchcock, of Nebraska, made a strong point the other day in presenting an amendment authorizing our consuls abroad to gather information as to the price charged on American-made goods which are sold abroad. In addressing the house Mr. Hitchcock stated:

"This matter is very largely in the interest of American manufacturers. To a very great extent these manufacturers are in the enjoyment of a high protective tariff to enable them to compete, as it has been supposed, with foreign manufacturers in the American fields. It is an open secret, a notorious fact, one I think not even denied, that a great many of these manufacturers are selling their goods in European and other markets to consumers abroad at prices much below the prices that they name in the American market and that American consumers are compelled to pay. Now, the object of my amendment is to require our agents in making reports on our foreign trade to include information for the American people on this important point, as to the prices of American-made goods in foreign lands. I am perfectly willing and the American people are perfectly willing to

have these agents of the United States investigate trade conditions for the purpose of developing such facts as may be helpful in spreading American trade, but it certainly seems to me that we should couple with them instructions to our agents to ascertain authoritatively and officially whether the charge is true that these American manufacturers, protected by law, favored by the government of the United States, are actually engaged in selling their products at prices to foreigners in foreign markets far below those that they charge to Americans in the American market. This additional information will cost nothing, and it certainly will be of value. If the charge is true, it ought to become known. If it is false, it will do no harm to ascertain that fact."

Mr. Hitchcock is entirely right and has presented the subject in a forceful style so characteristic of him. We have a right to know at what price American goods are being sold abroad and our consuls are the proper persons to secure this information. By all means let the facts be known and then let the republican leaders explain the facts if they can.



WOULD HE REMIT THE FINE?

Governor Hughes is arguing against fines—he says they are unjust to stockholders. He prefers imprisonment. Well imprisonment would be better but Mr. Rockefeller has not been imprisoned and that fine is the only penalty in sight. In view of the fact that Chancellor Day is for Governor Hughes and in view of the further fact that the younger Rockefeller has declared for Governor Hughes the question arises would Governor Hughes limit the \$29,000,000 fine if he were president? This may become a pertinent question—how will Governor Hughes answer it?

WOULD HE REMIT THE FINE?



A FAITHFUL DEMOCRAT

Here is a letter full of heart thrills. It needs no explanation. It speaks for itself:

San Francisco, Cal., January 29, 1908.—Editor Commoner: I enclose a postoffice money order of \$3 and five membership certificates. These were obtained by Mr. Manzer on his dying bed. He passed away January 23, after a long illness, but it was the earthly end of a long life spent in working for humanity and for true democracy and, as these certificates testify, his dying efforts were for the cause of humanity. He was born August 3, 1830 and there is no doubt that it was through his efforts that this state was carried for Lincoln. He was the first president of the Single Tax society in this city and an earnest worker for its principles. He was my husband and the best man I ever knew.

Yours cordially,

MRS. MARY J. MANZER.

The Commoner extends to Mrs. Manzer its condolence.



REAPING THE WHIRLWIND

The republican leaders sold the government at auction in 1896 and delivered the goods. In 1900 the contract was renewed—and now the people are paying the penalty. Those who sow the wind still reap the whirlwind.



EMERGENCY

If the emergency is such as to make an emergency currency necessary it is strange that so many of the financiers are willing to appoint a commission and put the whole thing over until after the election.



THE "FIRST GUN"

The republican convention in Florida was the "first gun of the campaign" and, considering that two delegations were elected, it may be regarded as a double-barrelled gun.

"DEAD EASY" IN WISCONSIN

Here's a good letter from Wisconsin: "Grand Rapids, Wis., Jan. 25, 1908.—Editor Commoner, Lincoln, Neb.: Inclosed please find money order for \$40.20 together with a list of sixty-seven subscribers and pledges to the million army membership. It is 'dead easy' obtaining subscribers for The Commoner this year.

"Respectfully yours,

"L. M. NASH."