

Don't you think the republican party has been in power long enough? Don't you think there are enough suspicious looking circumstances about Panama Canal affairs to justify the people in calling "OPEN THE BOOKS" on that great job? The only way to get the books opened is to change administrations.

"Well," said the questioner, "let me assure you that you are gaining on it."

And so, my friends, the trusts are gaining on the republican party. They are running faster than the republican party is. There is no hope of relief on the trust question from republican success. Why, my friends, Mr. Roosevelt has had seven years in which to carry out the policy of regulation; and there is a clause in the anti-trust law that provides a penitentiary penalty for any man or set of men conspiring in restraint of trade. It is just as plain as the law against horse stealing and yet, while the law against horse stealing is enforced the criminal law against the trusts is not enforced; and after seven years the president can not show one single trust magnate put behind prison bars and if a strenuous man like the president, following their idea of regulation can not imprison one trust magnate in seven years how long will it take a man, an amiable and complacent man like Mr. Taft, to get a trust magnate in the penitentiary?

The democratic party says that no trust should be permitted to exist; that is that no corporation should be permitted to convert itself into a trust. The democratic party believes that God never made a human being good enough to be at the head of a private monopoly, and decide each day without appeal, what price he will charge for that which the people must have and which he alone can furnish. The democratic plan is to draw a line and say that beyond that point the corporations shall not go. Does that mean the extermination of business? No, it means the revival of business. When they tell you that their trust fallacies will restore prosperity I remind you that it is under that very trust policy that we have come to the conditions that confront us.—From one of Mr. Bryan's speeches.

men who reckoned Mr. Bryan as a political dreamer and somewhat of a fanatic, and the most tolerant and kindly of his critics regarded him as dangerous in views and methods. The silver question was the great issue then, and his doctrine was esteemed as financial revolution portending commercial ruin.

Four years later, when he was again nominated, even many who agreed with his views opposed his selection and the policy of a second free silver pronouncement. The prevailing opinion of many democrats at that time was that if he suffered defeat the second time he would go down to history as a mere adventurer. His opponents in that contest denounced him as a rebel and a traitor because he resisted the retention of the Philippines.

In 1904, when he opposed Judge Parker, some of his former ardent supporters felt that he was playing "dog in the manger" with his party, and it seemed at St. Louis that he was permanently retired as democratic leader.

Notwithstanding all this, his third nomination was the mandate of the deliberate thought of an overwhelming majority of the party. And now, less than thirty days from the election, it is conceded by friends and foes alike that he is nearer to the White House than he ever was before.

This is a remarkable circumstance.

We need not go so far as to contend that events have vindicated every doctrine Mr. Bryan has advocated. It is a disputed question whether the free coinage of silver was a wise proposal in 1896; whether the prosperity which followed that campaign was a result of the increased supply of gold, or whether like results would have followed the increased supply of silver on the quantitative theory of money. No one will contend that Mr. Bryan's third nomination involves an indorsement of his ideas of government ownership. Indeed, the Philippine issue may be dismissed, though the republicans now talk of the ultimate independence of the island.

It is not any single or particular idea that these twelve years have vindicated; it is the character, integrity, manhood, courage and patriotism of Mr. Bryan that have been vindicated—his zeal for the man above the dollar, his devotion to the welfare and happiness of the masses, his opposition to the privileges and the power of the classes, his broad and deep human sympathy, his quick and unflinching courage in speaking his convictions, his eminent ability in commanding public thought and the tremendous force of his mental and moral energies.

He is no man's man, but all men's man. He is no creature of circumstance, but the master of circumstance. He owes his distinction to no boss or class or faction, but to his own conscientious aspirations and sense of duty in spite of bosses and classes and faction. Occasion and opportunity have favored him at times, but more often he has driven through disasters and discouragements that would have appalled and overwhelmed any man lacking the resources of real greatness.

The palpable drift toward him now, which promises if not arrested to carry him safely to the presidency, is undoubtedly the momentum of an increased and increasing esteem and confidence composed of these elements. It is accelerated by a corresponding lack of confidence in Mr. Taft as his own master and in the republican party as a pledge of good faith.

This is not to say that Mr. Taft is a man of no mind or purpose, but he has permitted himself to be obscured by the more pronounced personality of the president. He became a candidate, as we recall, at the president's behest; he entered the contest as the representative of the president's policies; his first utterances were scarcely more than echoes of the president, and during the last two weeks the president has become his spokesman, has gone so far as to publish his private letter about Foraker without consulting him and has thought it necessary to reiterate the assurance that he and he alone can save the republic by maintaining the Roosevelt policies. John Alden did not plead half so eloquently in behalf of Mr. Standish as Mr. Roosevelt is pleading for Mr. Taft, but the

American voter, like Priscilla, is not to be won that way. "Why don't you speak for yourself, John," might be said to Mr. Roosevelt if he had not put himself out of the contest, but politics, like love-making, is unsatisfactory by proxy.

Mr. Bryan is speaking for himself and for his party, and the people are more and more yielding to his argument and persuasive personality. It is a reasonable hope that his vindication will be completed in the November election.—Fort Worth Record.

MOVING HEAVILY

Following is an extract from an editorial that appeared in the New York Evening Post of Friday, October 9:

"There are many signs that the Hughes campaign in this state—and consequently the Taft campaign—is moving heavily. The local bosses who were compelled to take Hughes have not recovered from their soreness and are inclined to sulk. Nor have they the money to subsidize the country weeklies, hire 'workers,' pay the farmers for their 'time,' and get out the vote. Tammany, on the other hand, is not rent by dissensions, and promises to roll up a heavy majority in Greater New York, in spite of any possible defections to the ranks of Hearst. Evidently, then, when Governor Hughes finishes his engagements in the west, there must be a concentration of effort upon this state. And although Mr. Hughes alone is an effective campaigner, as he has already shown, the republican managers are well advised in supporting him with their best speakers; for if he goes down in New York, Mr. Taft is pretty sure to go down with him."

A MISQUOTATION

From an obviously inspired Washington dispatch to the Tribune:

"On October 14 the president answered, stating that he had heard that Mr. Harriman did not think it wise to come, and continued:

"If you think there is nothing special I should be informed about, or no matter in which I could give aid, why, of course, give up the visit for the time being, and then a few weeks hence, before I write my message, I shall get you to come down to discuss certain government matters not connected with the campaign."

Tut! tut! Keep the record straight. This is what the president wrote:

"If you think there is any danger of your visit to me causing trouble, or if you think there is nothing special," etc.

What could have been Anybody's purpose in cutting off the first part of that sentence, and conveying a false impression by beginning the second "if" with a capital "I"? Wisdom can not be supplanted by cunning while memories continue to be green.—Harper's Weekly.

VINDICATION OF BRYAN

Mr. Bryan is quite justified in the declaration that he has outlived the venomous attacks of his opponents. "Twelve years ago," he said to an Iowa audience, "you heard me called a demagogue. You saw them bury me and you heard them chant songs over my grave, and now they have explained how it happened that I was not dead."

"Demagogue" was among the least of the epithets applied to Mr. Bryan twelve years ago. "Revolutionist," "socialist" and "agitator" were common, and we all recall a cartoon in Harper's Weekly libeling him as an anarchist. Of course, much of that was ordinary campaign hyperbole, but there were thousands—indeed, millions—of

HUGHES ANSWERS HUGHES

Little Rock, Ark., October 13.—To the Editor of The Commoner: In his western crusade, Governor C. E. Hughes of New York, indulged in hilarious ridicule everywhere he spoke of that plank in the Denver platform providing that legislation should be enacted to prevent any corporation or combination in the form of a trust from controlling more than fifty per cent of the output of any manufactured product. He held up his hands in assumed horror over the fact, as contended by him, that this would deprive many thousands of work in the industries where they had been trained and turn them out on society without the means of making a living. The reading public is familiar with his boisterous argument but I have seen nowhere, either in speeches or in the current publications, any allusion to the governor's amazing personal inconsistency. It was he who prepared and used every power of his office to enact into law the New York insurance statute providing that no life insurance company however great its accumulations or however large its plan or however many with their families might be dependent thereon for a livelihood, should be allowed to write more than one hundred and fifty millions of risks in any one year. It may have an acquired capacity to write three times that amount but it must stop and turn out to grass two-thirds of its employees and dependences. The parable is perfect and might be commented on at length with profit as a test of the governor's sincerity. C. S. COLLINS.