

do what he wishes unchecked, provided he has enough money."—
What an arraignment of the predatory interests!

Is the president's indictment true? And, if true, against whom
was the indictment directed? Not against the democratic party.

MR. TAFT ENDORSES THE INDICTMENT

Mr. Taft says that these evils have crept in during the last ten years. He declares that, during this time, some "prominent and influential members of the community, spurred by financial success and in their hurry for greater wealth, became unmindful of the common rules of business honesty and fidelity, and of the limitations imposed by law upon their actions;" and that "the revelations of the breaches of trusts, the disclosures as to rebates and discriminations by railroads, the accumulating evidence of the violations of the anti-trust laws, by a number of corporations, and the over-issue of stocks and bonds of interstate railroads for the unlawful enriching of directors and for the purpose of concentrating the control of the railroads under one management,"—all these, he charges, "quicken the conscience of the people and brought on a moral awakening."

During all this time, I beg to remind you, republican officials presided in the executive department, filled the cabinet, dominated the senate, controlled the house of representatives and occupied most of the federal judgeships. Four years ago the republican platform boastfully declared that since 1860—with the exception of two years—the republican party had been in control of part or of all the branches of the federal government; that for two years only was the democratic party in a position to either enact or repeal a law. Having drawn the salaries; having enjoyed the honors; having secured the prestige, let the republican party accept the responsibility!

REPUBLICAN PARTY RESPONSIBLE

Why were these "known abuses" permitted to develop? Why have they not been corrected? If existing laws are sufficient, why have they not been enforced? All of the executive machinery of the federal government is in the hands of the republican party. Are new laws necessary? Why have they not been enacted? With a republican president to recommend, with a republican senate and house to carry out his recommendations, why does the republican candidate plead for further time in which to do what should have been done long ago? Can Mr. Taft promise to be more strenuous in the prosecution of wrong-doers than the present executive? Can he ask for a larger majority in the senate than his party now has? Does he need more republicans in the house of representatives or a speaker with more unlimited authority?

WHY NO TARIFF REFORM?

The president's close friends have been promising for several years that he would attack the iniquities of the tariff. We have had intimation that Mr. Taft was restive under the demands of the highly protected industries. And yet the influence of the manufacturers, who have for twenty-five years contributed to the republican campaign fund, and who in return have framed the tariff schedules, has been sufficient to prevent tariff reform. As the present campaign approached, both the president and Mr. Taft declared in favor of tariff revision, but set the date of revision after the election. But the pressure brought to bear by the protected interests has been great enough to prevent any attempt at tariff reform before the election; and the reduction promised after the election is so hedged about with qualifying phrases, that no one can estimate with accuracy the sum total of tariff reform to be expected in case of republican success. If the past can be taken as a guide, the republican party will be so obligated by campaign contributions from the beneficiaries of protection, as to make that party powerless to bring to the country any material relief from the present tariff burdens.

WHY NO ANTI-TRUST LEGISLATION?

A few years ago the republican leaders in the house of representatives were coerced by public opinion into the support of an anti-trust law which had the endorsement of the president, but the senate refused even to consider the measure, and since that time no effort has been made by the dominant party to secure remedial legislation upon this subject.

WHY NO RAILROAD LEGISLATION?

For ten years the Interstate Commerce Commission has been asking for an enlargement of its powers, that it might prevent rebates and discriminations, but a republican senate and a republican house of representatives were unmoved by its entreaties. In 1900 the republican national convention was urged to endorse the demand for railway legislation, but its platform was silent on the subject. Even in 1904, the convention gave no pledge to remedy

these abuses. When the president finally asked for legislation, he drew his inspiration from three democratic national platforms and he received more cordial support from the democrats than from the republicans. The republicans in the senate deliberately defeated several amendments offered by Senator LaFollette and supported by the democrats—amendments embodying legislation asked by the Interstate Commerce Commission. One of these amendments authorized the ascertainment of the value of railroads. This amendment was not only defeated by the senate, but it was overwhelmingly rejected by the recent republican national convention, and the republican candidate has sought to rescue his party from the disastrous results of this act by expressing himself, in a qualified way, in favor of ascertaining the value of the railroads.

OVER-ISSUE OF STOCKS AND BONDS

Mr. Taft complains of the over-issue of stocks and bonds of railroads, "for the unlawful enriching of directors and for the purpose of concentrating the control of the railroads under one management," and the complaint is well founded. But, with a president to point out the evil, and a republican congress to correct it, we find nothing done for the protection of the public. Why? My honorable opponent has, by his confession, relieved me of the necessity of furnishing proof; he admits the condition and he can not avoid the logical conclusion that must be drawn from the admission. There is no doubt whatever that a large majority of the voters of the republican party recognize the deplorable situation which Mr. Taft describes; they recognize that the masses have had but little influence upon legislation or upon the administration of the government, and they are beginning to understand the cause. For a generation, the republican party has drawn its campaign funds from the beneficiaries of special legislation. Privileges have been pledged and granted in return for money contributed to debauch elections. What can be expected when official authority is turned over to the representatives of those who first furnish the sinews of war and then reimburse themselves out of the pockets of the taxpayers?

FASTING IN WILDERNESS NECESSARY

So long as the republican party remains in power, it is powerless to regenerate itself. It can not attack wrong-doing in high places without disgracing many of its prominent members, and it, therefore, uses opiates instead of the surgeon's knife. Its malefactors construe each republican victory as an endorsement of their conduct and threaten the party with defeat if they are interfered with. Not until that party passes through a period of fasting in the wilderness, will the republican leaders learn to study public questions from the standpoint of the masses. Just as with individuals, "the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the truth," so in politics, when party leaders serve far away from home and are not in constant contact with the voters, continued party success blinds their eyes to the needs of the people and makes them deaf to the cry of distress.

PUBLICITY AS TO CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

An effort has been made to secure legislation requiring publicity as to campaign contributions and expenditures; but the republican leaders, even in the face of an indignant public, refused to consent to a law which would compel honesty in elections. When the matter was brought up in the recent republican national convention, the plank was repudiated by a vote of 880 to 94. Here, too, Mr. Taft has been driven to apologize for his convention and to declare himself in favor of a publicity law; and yet, if you will read what he says upon this subject, you will find that his promise falls far short of the requirements of the situation. He says:

"If I am elected president, I shall urge upon congress, with every hope of success, that a law be passed requiring the filing, in a federal office, of a statement of the contributions received by committees and candidates in elections for members of congress, and in such other elections as are constitutionally within the control of congress."

I shall not embarrass him by asking him upon what he bases his hope of success; it is certainly not on any encouragement he has received from republican leaders. It is sufficient to say that if his hopes were realized—if, in spite of the adverse action of his convention, he should succeed in securing the enactment of the very law which he favors, it would give but partial relief. He has read the democratic platform; not only his language, but his evident alarm, indicates that he has read it carefully. He even had before him the action of the democratic national committee in interpreting and applying that platform; and yet, he fails to say that he favors the publication of the contributions before the election. Of course, it satisfies a natural curiosity to find out how an election has been purchased, even when the knowledge comes too late to be of service, but why should the people be kept in darkness until