

DEMOCRACY'S APPEAL TO THE COUNTRY

Written for The Independent, New York, prior to election day.

Democracy's appeal to the country is based primarily upon the fact that the control of the government has been gradually taken away from the voters and deposited in the hands of the representatives of the favor-seeking corporations. Several means have been employed to defeat the popular will. First, the secret contribution of large sums of money has given to predatory wealth control over the campaign managers and obligated the candidates in advance. Second, the present method of electing United States senators has given these corporations an opportunity to secure the elevation of men to the senate who represented special interests rather than the people generally. Third, the rules of the house have been so interpreted as to enable the speaker to exercise a despotic control over legislation and prevent the consideration of remedial measures, even when those measures were favored by a majority of the members of congress. The democratic party proposes remedies for these evils. For the secret contributions, it proposes publicity—and it insists that the publicity should be before the election. This proposition was endorsed by unanimous vote in the democratic convention, and the democratic national committee has announced that it will apply the doctrine to the present campaign and publish, before the election, all contributions of more than one hundred dollars. The republican convention rejected a publicity plank, and the republican candidate, while favoring publicity after the election, has made an argument against publicity before the election. His argument, however, is a confession that the republican party is receiving contributions which it is afraid to make public before the election. To say that the contributions must be concealed for fear the motives of the givers will be misrepresented, or for fear a wrong impression will be formed of the obligations imposed upon the candidate, is a reflection upon the intelligence of the public.

The democratic remedy for the second evil is the election of senators by direct vote of the people. The democratic convention endorsed this proposition unanimously; the republican convention rejected the proposition, but the republican candidate has, since the convention, expressed his personal inclination toward the popular election of senators. "Personal inclination," however, is not sufficient. Congress must pass remedial measures before the president has an opportunity to sign them. The republican platform does not pledge its members of congress to publicity or to the popular election of senators. The democratic platform does pledge its candidates to congress, and a democratic victory will be a popular endorsement of these reforms, and with a democratic president and house of representatives to take the initiative, it is entirely probable that the senate will yield to the public demand, whereas its opposition to these reforms would be strengthened by a republican victory.

The democratic remedy for the third evil is such a reform of the rules of the house as will make sure of the right of the majority to control legislation. The republicans not only failed to denounce the present interpretation of the rules, but they nominated for vice president the man who stands next to Mr. Cannon in the interpretation and enforcement of the present rules.

The democratic party makes an appeal to the country upon economic questions, as well as upon questions affecting the method of government. The republican party promises unequivocally to revise the tariff immediately. The word "unequivocally" is a confession that the party is under suspicion, and is intended to distinguish the new promise from the old promises which have not been kept. The word "immediately" is an admission that tariff revision has been too long delayed, and is a pathetic appeal for a little more time in which to do that which could have been done and should have been done before. The word "revision" is used in place of reduction, and may mean an increase in the average rate rather than a decrease. If the republican party wins, there is every evidence that the revision, if one is made, would so disappoint the public as to lead to a four years agitation for reduction, and this would lead to uncertainty and unsettled business, whereas the democratic platform demands certain specific reductions, and business will soon adjust itself to these reductions. A democratic victory, therefore, gives assurance of industrial peace and prosperity.

Our platform offers, first, the free-list for

articles which come into competition with the trusts; that is, the trust magnates must give up either the trust business or the tariff wall. Second, material reductions on the necessities of life, especially on those articles which are sold abroad more cheaply than at home. Those manufacturers who can compete in the foreign markets do not need a fifty per cent tariff to enable them to compete in the home markets. Third, such other gradual reductions as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis. It will be noticed that these reductions will not be made all at once; no sudden transition is contemplated, but graduated progress toward a system under which the tariff laws will no longer be written by a few beneficiaries as a means of levying tribute upon the rest of the people.

The republican leaders, unable to meet the arguments presented in favor of tariff reduction, are now threatening a panic, but their threats will not frighten people who are now passing through a panic which came under a republican administration—and the republican candidate was a member of the administration—and under a tariff so high that even the republicans promise "unequivocally" to "revise" it "immediately." We have had three panics since 1860—the panic of 1873, which came under a republican president and under a high tariff, the panic of 1893, which came just after a republican administration and a year before the McKinley law was revealed, and the panic of 1907 which came under a republican president and under a high tariff.

On the trust question, the democratic party insists upon a legal definition of a trust, so that no business man will violate the law unknowingly, and upon the vigorous enforcement of the law so that no one who violates it knowingly will escape punishment. The republican plan is to create a trust and then have the government exhaust itself in the pursuit of the trust. The democratic party believes that it is better to prevent the creation of a monopoly, and proposes to make it impossible for a private monopoly to exist. About 127 trusts were organized under Mr. McKinley's administration, and about 166 under Mr. Roosevelt's administration, while less than fifty were organized under previous administrations. Regulation is not sufficient. The monopolies have regulated the government instead of being regulated by it. They have corrupted politics and even officials and they have converted business into a lottery where a few draw capital prizes and the rest draw blanks.

The democrats propose to draw a line beyond which a corporation can not go in the control of the product in which it deals. According to the plan set forth in the democratic platform, federal supervision will be added to (not substituted for) state supervision, whenever a corporation controls 25 per cent of the total product, and it shall not be permitted to control more than 50 per cent. While it is growing from 25 to 50 per cent, it will be subjected to such restrictions as may be necessary, one of them being that it shall sell to all consumers in the United States at the same price, due allowance being made for the cost of transportation.

On the labor question, the democratic party believes in the establishment of a department of labor with a cabinet officer at its head. The republican party opposes this. The democratic party believes that the labor organization should not be under the operation of the anti-trust law, but that such regulation as may be necessary shall be provided through legislation made for human beings—the anti-trust law being intended for matter and merchandise. The republican party is opposed to us on this question.

The democratic party believes that an industrial dispute should not, in itself, be a ground for the issuance of an injunction—that an injunction ought not to be issued in an industrial dispute unless there are conditions which would justify an injunction, even if there were no industrial dispute. The republicans oppose us on this proposition.

The democratic party believes that a person accused of indirect contempt—accused of an act which was committed outside of the presence of the court and must be established by evidence—should have the right of trial by jury to ascertain his guilt or innocence. The republican party is opposed to trial by jury in such cases, and the republican candidate has assailed our plank as an assault upon the judiciary, forgetting that we simply endorse a measure which passed the senate twelve years ago, with but one senator opposing it, and such republican senators as Senator Sherman, Senator AHE-

son, Senator Hale, Senator Morrill, Senator Hawley, Senator Cullom and Senator Nelson either approving of the measure or remaining silent during its discussion.

The democratic party is in favor of legislation which will protect depositors, preferring the guaranteed bank to the postal savings bank. If the banks will establish a guaranty fund and thus protect depositors, it will be better than to have the government enter upon so large a work as the establishment of postal savings banks, and yet, if the bankers refuse to provide security for depositors, they must be prepared to meet the postal savings bank. At the coming election more than 90 per cent of the voters will vote for more security, some voting with the republicans for the postal savings bank, others voting with the democrats for the guaranteed bank.

The democratic party believes in an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to give ultimate independence to the Filipinos. The republican platform is silent in regard to the nation's purpose, and Mr. Taft's statement that they are to have ultimate independence—but not in less than two generations—is not binding upon the republican party and is not an authoritative announcement of the nation's policy. The reservation of coaling stations and harbors will give us all the commercial advantage that we could obtain from the retaining of the Philippine Islands, while the promise of ultimate independence, to be kept as soon as a stable government is established, will restore our nation to its place of leadership, and enable it to proclaim again the doctrines set forth in the declaration of independence.

The democratic party favors economy in public expenditures and condemns the extravagance of the republican party. Appropriations have been increasing more rapidly than population. The republican leaders have been teaching that a tax is a blessing, and seem disposed to make the blessing as large as possible, while the beneficiaries of a high tariff favor large expenditures as an excuse for the retention of exorbitant tariff rates.

The democratic party opposes the interference of the executive in politics. The presidency belongs to the whole country and ought not to be used by the president, as a personal asset to secure the selection of the nominee of his party, or as a party asset, to be used by the president for the benefit of his party. Official reports, published at the government's expense, inform the public of the work of the administration, and the people ought to be left free to sit in judgment upon public affairs and to select their officials without executive interference.

These are a few of the questions upon which democracy makes an appeal to the country. We charge the republican leaders with responsibility for present conditions, and we make a distinction between the republican leaders and the republican rank and file. The republican leaders do not represent the voters of their own party, and can no longer claim the support of these voters. The investigations and revelations have aroused the nation's conscience, and to that conscience we appeal. We desire a restoration of the government to the hands of the people, that it may henceforth be controlled by the people in their own interests, in order that each citizen may be assured of an opportunity to secure a reward from society proportionate to the service which he renders to society.—(Mr. Bryan in the New York Independent.)

THE SQUARE DEAL IN POLITICS

We use the term "politics" in reference to both the subject of government and the subject of parties, and I shall speak of the "square deal" as it relates to both.

There are two theories of government, one—the monarchical theory—is that a government is thirteen inches in diameter, round in shape and fired out of a cannon—an organization resting upon force. The other is that a government is a thing made by the people for themselves, to be administered for the advancement of their own welfare by themselves directly, or by representatives of their own choice—a government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed. I shall only deal with the latter theory of government since it is the only theory which we recognize as sound in this country.

A square deal in representative government consists in the operation of the government according to the theory upon which it rests. All officials, executive, legislative and judicial,