

and the privates in the ranks. As the dividing is done largely by the captains, it is not unnatural that they should magnify their part and appropriate too large a share; neither is it unnatural that there should be complaint on the part of the toilers who think that their recompense is insufficient.

The labor question, therefore, as it presents itself at this time, is chiefly a question of distribution, and the legislation asked for is legislation which will secure to each that to which his services entitle him. As legislation is secured through the ballot every one should use the ballot to obtain the legislation necessary. The democratic platform presents the ideal toward which the Democratic party is striving, namely, justice in the distribution of rewards. The Democratic party proclaims that each individual should receive from society a reward for his toil commensurate with his contribution to the welfare of society, and unless some other party can do the work better,

the Democratic party ought to have the support of all, whether they belong to the wage-earning class or occupy positions in which they direct the efforts of others. If an officer in the industrial army were sure that his children and his children's children would inherit his position, he might feel possibly indifferent as to those under his command, but the children of those who, today, work for wages may employ the children of those who, in this generation, are employers. This uncertainty as to future generations, as well as our sense of justice, should lead us to make the government as nearly perfect as possible, for a good government is the best legacy that a parent can leave to his child. Riches may take the wings of the morning and fly away, but government is permanent, and we cannot serve posterity better than by contributing to the perfection of the government, that each child born into the world may feel that it has here an opportunity for the most complete development, and a chance to secure, through service, the largest possible happiness and honor.

THE STATE AND THE NATION

Extracts from Address Delivered by Mr. Bryan at Peoria, Ill., September 9

The success of our system of government rests upon the careful observance of the constitutional division of power between the state and the nation. A number of expressions have been coined to describe the relations existing between the federal government and the several subdivisions, but no one has been more felicitous in definitions than Jefferson or more accurate in drawing lines of demarcation. He presented the historic position of the Democratic party when he declared himself in favor of "the support of the state governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies," and "the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our safety at home and peace abroad." The democratic platform, adopted at Denver, quotes the language of Jefferson and declares that it expresses the party's position at this time.

It would be almost as difficult to maintain a free, self-governing republic over a large area and with a large population without state governments as it would be to maintain such a republic without a general government. The interests of the different parts of the country are so varied, and the matters requiring legislative attention so numerous, that it would be impossible to have all of the work done at the national capitol. One has only to examine the bills introduced in each Congress, and then add to the number the bills introduced at the legislative sessions of each of the forty-six states, to realize that it would be beyond the power of any body of men to legislate intelligently on the multitude of questions that require consideration.

Not only would national legislators lack the time necessary for investigation, and therefore lack the information necessary to wise decision, but the indifference of representatives in one part of the country to local matters in other parts of the country would invite the abuse of power. Then, too, the seat of government would be so far from the great majority of the voters as to prevent that scrutiny of public conduct which is essential to clean and honest government. The union of the separate states under a federal government offers the only plan that can adapt itself to indefinite extension.

Our constitution expressly reserves to the states and to the people respectively all powers not delegated to the federal government, and only by respecting this division of powers can we hope to keep the government within the reach of the people and responsive to the will of the people. Because in all disputes as to the relative spheres of the nation and the states the final decision rests with the federal courts, the tendency is naturally toward centralization, and greater care is required to preserve the reserved rights of the states than to maintain the authority of the general government.

In recent years another force has been exerting an increasing influence in extending the authority of the central government. I refer to the great corporations. They prefer the federal courts to the state courts, and employ every possible device to drag litigants before United States judges. They also prefer congressional regulation to state regulation, and those interested in large corporations have for years been seeking federal incorporation. The Democratic party will resist every attempt to obliterate state lines, whether the attempt is made through legislation or through judicial interpretation. Amendment of the organic law by judicial interpretation would be destructive of constitutional government; our constitution can be amended by the people in accordance with the terms of the document itself, and no group of men, however honorable or high minded, can usurp this power without violating the fundamental principles of our government.

It has been suggested that the rights of the states can lapse through non-use, and that Congress is justified in usurping the authority of the state if the state fails to make proper use of it. While

this doctrine has been advanced in the pretended interest of the people, it is as insidious and as dangerous an assault as has ever been made on our constitutional form of government. The people of the state can act with more promptness than the people of the nation, and if they fail to act, it must be assumed that the people of the state prefer inaction.

The real purpose that those have in view who complain of the inaction of the state, is not more strict regulation of corporations, but the relief of corporations from state regulation.

The Democratic party favors the full exercise of the powers of the government for the protection of the rights of the people—each government to act within its constitutional sphere. Our platform demands that federal legislation be *added to, not substituted for,* state legislation.

The predatory corporations have taken advantage of the dual character of our government and have tried to hide behind state rights when prosecuted in the federal courts and behind the interstate commerce clause of the constitution when prosecuted in the state courts.

There is no twilight zone between the nation and the state in which the exploiting interests can take refuge from both. There is no neutral ground where, beyond the jurisdiction of either sovereignty, the plunderers of the public can find a safe retreat. As long as a corporation confines its activities to the state in which it was created, it is subject to state regulation only; but as soon as it invades interstate commerce it becomes amenable to federal laws as well as to the laws of the state which created it and the laws of the states in which it does business.

How strict can these laws be? Just as strict as may be necessary for the protection of the public.

Our platform outlines the regulation deemed necessary, and the regulation is specifically set forth in order that our opponents may not be able to scare the public by predicting hurtful legislation. Our platform, unlike the republican platform, says what it means and means only what it says.

A distinction is drawn between the railroads and other corporations. The railroad, being a quasi-public corporation and, as such, being permitted to exercise a part of the sovereignty of the state, is subject to regulation at the hands of both the nation and the state, but this regulation is intended, not to cripple the railroads but to increase their efficiency. The people at large are as much interested as the stockholders are in the successful operation of the railroads. Their own pecuniary interests as well as their sense of justice would restrain them from doing anything that would impair the road or reduce its efficiency. The traveling public is vitally interested in the payment of wages sufficient to command the most intelligent service, for life as well as property is in the hands of those who operate the trains, guard the switches, and keep the track in repair.

The Democratic party would distinguish between those railroad owners, directors and managers who, recognizing their obligation to the public, earn their salaries by conscientious devotion to the work entrusted to them, and those unscrupulous "Napoleons of Finance" who use railroads as mere pawns in a great gambling game without regard to the rights of employes or to the interests of the patrons. It is in the interest of honest railroading and legitimate investment that the Democratic party seeks to ascertain the present value of the railroad properties and to prevent for the future the watering of stock and the issue of fictitious capitalization; and it is in the interest of both the railroads and the public that it seeks only such reductions in transportation rates as can be made without wage reduction, without deterioration in the service and without injustice to legitimate investments. The Democratic party insists that in the matter of regulation of railroads both the state governments and the