

The Commoner.

CHARLES W. BRYAN, PUBLISHER

VOL. 8, NO. 38

Lincoln, Nebraska, October 2, 1908

Whole Number 402

FIGS OF THISTLES?

Collier's Weekly is on the list of publications to which republican managers point with pride as the supporters of Mr. Taft. Following are extracts from an article that appeared recently in Collier's Weekly:

"The election and subsequent death of Mr. Taft would mean the occupancy of the White House by an official fat-fryer who has during several years past approached, with deferential hat in hand, the president or treasurer of most of the large corporations in the country. It was in the course of this official function that Sherman was profanely turned down by Mr. Harriman, with bitter denunciation of the republican party and reeking messages for the head of that party, that the party and the head of it had not been grateful for the \$250,000 which Mr. Harriman collected and gave in 1904. Penrose, as one of the executive committee of nine which is to do the actual work of the republican campaign, is an error of taste and judgment, but not a great deal worse. With T. Coleman Dupont, of Delaware, however, the case differs. Among the combinations now being prosecuted by the federal government is that aggregation of companies known as the powder trust. Mr. Dupont is president of the \$50,000,000 Dupont Powder company, president of the \$10,000,000 International Powder Company, director of the International Smokeless Powder company, and vice president of the holding company, the Delaware Securities company, which owns a majority of the stock of the Laffin and Rand Powder company."

"Suppose that Mr. Taft, being successful, should be approached by Mr. Dupont thus: 'I am one of the ten men, including Chairman Hitchcock, who have put you over the plate. I don't want to be reminding you continually of the obligation; there is one small piece of patronage I should like, and I shan't speak to you about patronage again during your administration. There is a deserving young friend of mine whom I should like to have appointed to the position lately held by Mr. Purdy, in charge of that bureau of the department of justice which is seeking to break up my company, deprive me of some of my property, and declare me a violator of the law.' Something analogous would have been the presence of Harry Thaw two years ago on a committee of ten to collect funds and promote the election of Jerome as district attorney."

"A minority plank calling for a statute providing for publicity of campaign expenditures was thrown out of the committee on resolutions by a vote of 52 to 1, and was rejected on the floor of the convention by a vote of 880 to 94—Nebraska and Idaho and parts of Wisconsin and Indiana favoring it. The amount of Bourbonism still left in the republican party is far too large."

Senator Hopkins of Illinois is quoted as saying: "There is no more reason that a man should be guaranteed the return of his funds placed in a national bank than a farmer should be guaranteed his crop."

Why, then, does the government require of national banks a guarantee for the return of government funds?

"THE CALAMITY HOWLER"



Not Very Convincing to These Men

MR. BRYAN TO MR. ROOSEVELT

From Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Mr. Bryan gave to the Associated Press his reply to Mr. Roosevelt's attack upon him. Mr. Bryan's letter follows:

MILWAUKEE, Sept. 26, 1908.—"Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, Washington, D. C.—Dear Sir: While I have not yet received your letter and shall not until I reach home, next week, I have read a copy of it in the press, and beg leave to submit the following reply:

Mr. Haskell, having voluntarily resigned from the committee that he might be more free to prosecute those who have brought charges against him, I need not discuss the question of his guilt or innocence further than to say that the public service he has rendered and the vote of confidence he has received from the people of his state ought to protect him from condemnation until the charges can be examined in some court where partisanship does not bias and where campaign exigencies do not compel prejudgment.

I would not deem it necessary to address you further but for the fact that you seize upon the charges and attempt to make political capital out of them. You even charge that my connection with Mr. Haskell's selection as a member of the resolutions committee and as treasurer of the committee raises a question as to my sincerity as an opponent of trusts and monopolies. As an individual and as the candidate of my party, I resent the charge and repel the insinuation. I have been in public life for eighteen years, and I have been sufficiently conspicuous to make my conduct a matter of public interest. I have passed through two political campaigns in which party feeling ran high and epithet was exchanged. I have no hesitation in saying that you

cannot find an act, a word or a thought of mine to justify your partisan charge.

I have never been informed of any charge that had been made against Mr. Haskell connecting him with the Standard Oil company or with any other trust. I had known him as a leader in the constitutional convention of Oklahoma and had known him as one of the men principally responsible for that excellent legislation since adopted by a majority of over 100,000, 70,000 of which was furnished by republicans. I had known of his election to the governorship of that great young state by a majority of some 30,000; I had known that the constitution was adopted and that Governor Haskell was elected in spite of the efforts of your administration and in spite of the speeches made in Oklahoma by Mr. Taft.

You say that it was a matter of common notoriety that Mr. Haskell was connected with the Standard Oil company. I have a right to assume that if so serious an objection had existed to Mr. Haskell's election and had been a matter of common notoriety in Ohio, as you say, Judge Taft would have felt it his conscientious duty to warn the people when he spoke in Oklahoma. If he did not have the knowledge, why can it be assumed that I had it. And if he had it, how can you excuse his failure to communicate the information of the people of Oklahoma. If you feel it your patriotic duty to denounce Mr. Haskell when he is only a member of the national organization, how much more would Mr. Taft have felt it his patriotic duty to denounce Mr. Haskell when he was aspiring to be the chief executive of a great state?

I could have no knowledge of the suit to which you refer when he was appointed chairman of the resolutions committee of the democratic