

## Mr. Bryan's Reply to the Chicago Tribune

At Buffalo, New York, Mr. Bryan paid attention to some questions propounded to him by the Chicago Tribune, a republican newspaper. He said:

A candidate can not attempt to answer all the questions that are put to him by the opposition—not even by opponents of prominence. If he did so, he would be kept busy answering questions all the time, and would thus allow others to outline his plan of campaign, rather than outline it himself, and, of course, the opponents would be interested in leading him away from the subjects most dangerous to the enemy.

I am going to make an exception, however, in this case, and answer three questions propounded by one of the leading newspapers of the west, namely, the Chicago Tribune. The questions are pertinent and deserve a frank answer. I will state the questions in the order in which they appear in an editorial of September 19, and trust that the answers will be satisfactory to the Tribune.

**Question One**—If a republican senate would not submit to Mr. Taft's kindly suggestions concerning labor legislation, how can you promise, or even intimate, that your election would result in procuring the same senate to do what you say they would not do for Mr. Taft?

If I am elected, it is probable that the house of representatives will be democratic. I can recommend legislation in accordance with my platform, and the democrats of the house, being pledged to the same platform, will approve of the measures. It will then be up to the senate, and I will not assume that all of the republican senators will be willing to disregard a deliberate expression of opinion upon the part of the American people. "Shall the people rule?" is declared by our platform to be the over-shadowing issue in this campaign. Is the Tribune prepared to say that a republican senate will, as a matter of course, disregard the decision of the voters as expressed in the election of a president and house of representatives? The democrats in the senate assisted the president in coercing republican senators into supporting the rate bill; is it not possible that we can get a few republican senators to act with the democrats in enacting labor legislation, after the people have declared for it at the polls? If Mr. Taft is elected, a republican house will probably be elected also. This would mean a rejection of the labor planks of the democratic platform, and Mr. Taft, even if he were more disposed toward labor legislation than he is, could hardly expect either the house or senate to endorse measures rejected at the polls.

**Question Two**—How do you expect to secure any of the legislation you are promising the people unless you have the hearty support of a republican senate and a republican congress, and at the same time base your claim to the votes of the people upon the assumption that the republican party is against your every policy?

As I said before, if I am elected, the house will probably be democratic and we will have only a republican senate to deal with, and in case our victory is a decided one, we will make gains in the senate. These gains will not only add to the democratic vote, but they will encourage the democrats in the senate and weaken republican opposition in the senate. The Tribune fails to distinguish between the republican leaders and the republican voters. When we say that the republican leaders are against the policies for which we stand, we do not admit that the republican voters are against those policies. In fact, we assert the contrary. We believe that a majority of the republican voters are really with the democrats, and that by voting with the democrats, they can rebuke the republican leaders and compel those leaders to yield to public demands. Until there is a vote, the republican leaders may claim that their position is supported by the voters, but if the voters repudiate the republican leadership, and declare for the reforms outlined in the democratic platform, we may expect enough support from the republicans in the senate to accomplish reforms. Take, for instance, a publicity law. The republican convention rejected, by a vote of nine to one, the plank favoring publicity. Mr. Taft has expressed his personal desire to see a publicity law passed, although he only goes half way, advocating publicity after the election, instead of before. In case of a republican victory, will not the convention's

action have more influence upon the senators and members of the house, than Mr. Taft's personal inclinations or wishes? If, on the contrary, the democrats win, is it likely that a republican senate would defy this demand of the people, as expressed at the polls?

Take also the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people. This proposition was rejected by the republican national convention by a vote of seven to one. Mr. Taft has expressed a personal inclination toward popular election of senators, but a republican victory would be construed by republican leaders as a rejection of the proposition, and Mr. Taft would find it difficult to secure favorable action, even, if he tried, and there is no assurance that he would try, for he has never spoken on the subject but once, so far as I know, and then he only says, "personally, I am inclined to favor it." If I am elected, and a democratic house with me, it is fair to assume that the popular verdict will be effective in securing the election of senators by the people, especially when a number of republican senators are already committed to the proposition.

It must be remembered that in a number of states, the republican platforms declare for this reform, and those republicans who favor the election of senators by direct vote will be strengthened in their faith in this reform by a democratic victory, especially since I promised in my notification speech to call a special session of congress, if elected, and urge the submission of this amendment.

Take, again, the rules of the house. Only a democratic house will reform those rules and I am doing what I can to secure a democratic house.

**Question Three**—We respectfully ask what legislation, what remedies, what tariff reforms, what anything legislative during the next four years could you, as a democratic president, give to the people without the co-operation of a republican senate?

It is probable that we shall have a republican senate for the next two years, since it would be well-nigh impossible to make enough changes in the personnel of the senate this year to give the democrats a majority, but we can make a beginning this year and then, by presenting tariff reform measures, measures against trusts, measures for more effective railroad regulation, measures for the insuring of bank deposits, measures carrying out the labor reforms, measures declaring for the ultimate independence of the Philippines, and other measures outlined in our platform—measures to be recommended by a democratic president and endorsed by a democratic house—we can compel a republican senate to accept these reforms or its refusal will present a definite issue two years hence. It is reasonable to assume that the republicans in the senate will recognize the trend of public opinion and see the folly of putting themselves on record in opposition to the deliberate judgment of the voters. If the republican leaders show themselves indifferent to the wishes of the voters, they will invite a more sweeping change in the personnel of the senate. Will they not submit to the inevitable, and join in securing the more important of the reforms, in order to conciliate the voters?

But let us consider for a moment the real proposition presented by the Tribune. It is this: If you have a republican senate, you must elect a republican president and a republican house to act with the senate. If that is true this year, will it not be true four years from now, and eight years from now, and twelve years from now, and forever afterward? If we elect a republican president and a republican house, the natural effect of such an election will be to keep the senate republican for at least two years, and then, with a republican president and a republican senate, the Tribune will argue that we must have a republican house, and the election of a republican house in 1910 would help to keep the senate republican for two years longer, for the legislatures which will elect senators two years hence will be elected at the same time that the congressmen are elected. In 1912, therefore, the Tribune could propound the same questions to the democratic candidate that it now propounds, and if it could persuade the people to adopt its theory, it could keep the republican party in power perpetually by using the republican senate as a club.

Mr. Taft does not stand for needed labor legislation; he does not stand for tariff reduc-

tion at all—his platform uses the word "revision," not "reduction;" he does not stand for the elimination of the principle of private monopoly; he does not propose any definite legislation for the protection of the people against the trusts; he opposes the plan of the democratic party to insure bank depositors from loss; he stands for extravagance in expenditures, and he stands for executive interference in the matter of elections, for his nomination was secured by the president, and he is now being urged by the president who attempts to turn the prestige of the nation's highest office to the advantage of a political party.

If the people want to endorse the republican platform, they ought to vote the republican ticket; if they want to endorse the democratic platform, they ought to vote the democratic ticket. It is not only illogical, but absurd to say that they must vote for republican congressmen and a republican president, merely because the senate is so constituted that it is impossible to make a complete change in its personnel at this election.



### AN EPITAPH

It is amazing, it is pitiful, it is humiliating. Their sins, indeed, have found them out at last. Scandals to right of them; scandals to left of them; defeat in front of them; only the Taft-Sinton millions between: Cannon clinging to "Sunny Jim"—Aldrich falling upon the neck of son-in-law Rockefeller—the thieving tariff exuding fat no longer, but making quagmires for the robber trusts—the people disgusted on the one hand or indignant on the other—the grand old party of graft and fraud is, in truth, a sight to see. Yet a little longer and then the boneyard, leaving only a stench behind, and this inscription:

Whilst it lived it lived in clover;  
When it died, it died all over.  
—Henry Watterson in the Courier-Journal.

### WHY BILL FELT EASY

Last fall when all my work was done  
I thought I'd take some well earned fun;  
Just thought I'd spend about a week  
A visitin' my friend, Bill Peek  
With whom I ust'er fight an' play—  
Bill lives down Oklahoma way—  
So down I went, as free from care  
As anybody anywhere.

"How's tricks, ol' man?" says Bill t' me.  
"O, bully, Bill, I'm up in G."  
An' then I told him of success  
That I had earned through storm and stress.  
"Some years were fat an' some were lank,  
But I got money in th' bank;  
An' now I guess as how I will  
Quit workin' hard," says I t' Bill.

That night along 'bout 8 o'clock  
I got a mighty sudden shock—  
A message from my wife that said:  
"Our bank is broke!" An' home I sped.  
In less than one short half a day  
I saw my savin's fade away.  
The bank was broke—'tween me an' you  
T' date I ain't got nary sou.

This fall Bill came t' visit me  
An' found me workin' hard, b'gee!  
But we went visitin' aroun'  
An' spent some leisure time in town.  
Says Bill t' me: "In that there wreck  
It seems you got it in th' neck."  
"Correct," says I, "you stated facts—  
Right where th' chicken got th' ax."

That night Bill read his bank had closed,  
An' I jus' nacherly supposed  
He'd hike f'r home a feelin' blue,  
Jus' like I had—an' so would you.  
But Bill he laughed an' said: "I guess  
That ain't a goin' t' make distress."  
"But all your money, Bill?" I said.  
"Guaranteed," said Bill; "let's go t' bed."

—W. M. M.