

DEMOCRATS CANNOT SUPPORT BRYAN

Leaders in the Party All Over the Country Quit the Nebraskan Office-Seeker and Come Out for Taft.

"Cleveland Democrats" Refuse to Be Whipped Into Line and Organize to Fight the Man Who Disrupted the Party—Solid South Shows Signs of Breaking Up.

One of the best indications that the Taft and Sherman ticket will sweep the country in November is found in the continued numerous defections of heretofore prominent Democrats from that party. Practically all of them give as a reason that they cannot support the thrice offered candidate and his changeable and unstable theories of government. They simply cannot bring themselves to be identified with Bryan.

Perhaps the most mortifying incidents which the Democrats have experienced in the present campaign were in Massachusetts, where two big men named as Democratic presidential electors declined to serve on the ground that they were unable to support Mr. Bryan and greatly preferred Mr. Taft. These men were Ferdinand Strauss and C. H. P. Gould, of Lyons Falls, both business men of the first rank. Mr. Strauss, especially, has been prominent in the Massachusetts Democracy for a long time. Their declination to serve as Bryan electors caused a sensation in the old Bay State and throughout the country.

Democratic Congressman for Taft
Eugene Walter Leake, Democratic Representative in Congress from New Jersey, called at Republican National Committee headquarters early this month to offer his services on the stump for William H. Taft. Though he has been a staunch Democrat all his life, he is bitterly opposed to William Jennings Bryan and because he believes that the election of Bryan to the Presidency would mean the greatest calamity to the country since the civil war, he is ready to exert himself to the utmost to aid the election of Judge Taft. He is speaking at Republican rallies throughout the Eastern States.

Democrats Organize to Fight Bryan.
That the sentiments felt by these men are shared by many in New York is shown in the organization of the "Cleveland Democracy," an association whose principles are anti-Bryan, and which has been formed, according to the articles of incorporation, "to revive the true spirit of Democracy among the voters of Harlem and of the whole city." Headquarters have been opened and the club is doing active work, not, it is almost unnecessary to say, in the interests of the continuous Nebraska office-seeker.

John R. Dos Passos, a leading New York lawyer and author, who has always been a Democrat, has come out in a long statement announcing his allegiance to Taft and denouncing Bryanism and the remnants of the party which Bryan controls. "I am a Democrat," he says, "I expect to cast my vote for Mr. Taft." William B. Davenport, a well-known Brooklyn Democrat, for many years Public Administrator of Kings County, has denounced the Democratic platform and is now a vice president of the Taft-Sherman Lawyers' Club.

Anti-Bryan Sentiment Widespread.
Former Special City Judge Irving K. Baxter, of Utica, N. Y., who has always been a Democrat, and was elected on that ticket, not only has repudiated Bryan, but will take the stump and advocate the election of William H. Taft. Even up in Maine, where the members of the Democratic minority are supposed to be hopelessly big game, there is defection. W. H. McLaughlin, of Scarborough, for instance, announces that he has become so disgusted with Bryan in the Haskell controversy that he has swung over to the Republican party.

After hearing Judge Taft speak at St. Louis, J. D. Houseman, of Denver, Colo., a well-known railroad builder, announced his conversion to the Republican party and its candidates. Mr. Houseman had been a loyal Democrat for many years. This incident of course, is a direct tribute to Judge Taft's powers as a campaigner, of which many evidences were produced on his now famous western trip.

"Conversions" in the West.
At St. Joseph, Mo., one of the features was the "conversion" of W. F. Davis, a prominent Democrat, who went to a meeting at the stock yards to see Mr. Taft. After sizing up the latter Mr. Davis declared: "I thought I would vote for Mr. Bryan, but this man surely looks good to me." Another Missouri Democrat, E. B. Haywood, a Burlington Railroad conductor of St. Louis, evidently was similarly impressed; at any rate, he has announced that Taft will get his vote. Noticeable among the vice presidents at the Taft reception at St. Louis were James E. Smith, head of the St. Louis Business Men's League, and Frederick N. Judson, well-known lawyer, both Democrats who have declared their intention of supporting Taft.

Some readers will remember that in 1890 Webster Davis, former mayor of Kansas City, and assistant secretary

of the interior under McKinley, bolted McKinley to take the stump for Bryan. Well, Webb Davis now lives in Los Angeles, and is back in the Republican fold, this time to stay, he declares. He says Taft is going to win and he is hoisting him all he can.

In Chicago the Business Men's Taft and Sherman Club has been doing strong work in the campaign. Two of the organizers of the club were former Democrats. They are Franklin MacVeagh, wholesale grocer, and Frank H. Jones, secretary of the American Trust and Savings Bank.

Antagonism to Bryan in South.
A former mayor of Birmingham, Ala., spoke to a correspondent for the Baltimore American, as follows: "I can give you the names of 100 prominent men in this community who hope for Bryan's defeat. They are not going about beating drums or proclaiming their intentions from the house-tops, but they mean to vote the Republican ticket. They are tired of supporting a candidate who has always some fad to offer that is fundamentally wrong and foolish."

A special correspondent of the New York Evening Post, writing from Atlanta, Ga., says: "There is every evidence on the surface now that the Republican vote in Georgia will be the largest ever cast."

Jerome Hill, a Tennessee capitalist and cotton broker, well known in the South, writes to the Chattanooga Star saying that he has abandoned Democracy and will vote for Taft. "A man like myself," he declares, who was four years in Lee's army and for forty years a Jeffersonian Democrat, fails to see in this modern mongrel Democracy anything to appeal to him as a patriot or for the best interests of himself or his people. From sea to sea this country is prosperous. The question is, shall we destroy this most healthy condition by the election of Mr. Bryan, with his many theories and impracticable suggestions?" He answers that he will support Taft. He says there are thousands of former Confederates in Tennessee who are with him.

William Weems, a lifelong Democrat of Frederick, Md., has announced that he will not support Bryan at the election. "Bryan is too chimerical in his views for the chief executive of a great nation," says Mr. Weems.

John R. Dorsey, of Baltimore, vice-president of the William E. Hooper & Son Company, manufacturers of cotton duck, is another of the many Baltimore Democrats who have come out warmly for Taft.

Gen. Simon Buckner, who ran with Palmer on the gold Democratic presidential ticket, in an interview in Baltimore, said that Bryan was not a Democrat and that he intended to vote for Taft. "Bryan is a populist and a socialist," said the general.

These examples are only a few of a countless number all over the country which could be enumerated. Yet they serve sufficiently to show the popular state of mind.

THE ADMITTED SUPREMACY OF AMERICA.

is chiefly due to the fact that its workmen are better fed than those of any other country.

In the Spanish-American War it was "the man behind the gun" who made the American victory so quick and decisive.

And it is due to "the man behind the gun" in the factory—the workman—that American manufacturing is capturing the markets of the world.

The American workman can do more work and better work than any other workman because he is full of energy and vim—because of his better food, clothing and home conditions.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY has protected him against the cheap labor of Europe.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY has by wise and far-seeing laws built up American trade to such an extent that the American workman is paid almost three times the wages of European workmen.

If the working men of the United States want these conditions to continue they will vote for the party which has created high wages, namely

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

Function of Next Administration. (Judge Taft at St. Louis, October 8.)

"The function of the next administration is not to be spectacular in the enactment of great statutes laying down new codes of morals, or asserting a new standard of business integrity, but its work lies in the details of furnishing men and machinery to aid the hand of the Executive in making the supervision of the transactions so close, so careful, so constant, that the business men engaged in it may know promptly when they are transgressing the line of lawful business limitations and may be brought up standing whenever this occurs and may be prosecuted where the violations of law are flagrant and defiant, and promptly restrained and penalized."

Some of the Democratic newspapers recognize the situation well enough to begin already to pick out Cabinet officers for President Taft, but that is something that President Taft can do much better himself.—Philadelphia Press.

"MY RECORD IS A SUFFICIENT ANSWER."

—W. J. Bryan, in Letter to President Roosevelt.
Copyright, 1908, American Journal Examiner.



—From New York Journal.

TO MIDDLE WEST AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN STATES REPUBLICANS.

You want Mr. Taft and Mr. Sherman elected, and they cannot be elected unless the Republican National Committee has sufficient money to pay the legitimate expenses of the campaign. It costs money to maintain an organization. It requires money to pay for printing, postage, salaries or stenographers and clerks at headquarters, traveling expenses of speakers and numerous other details that go to make the campaign end successfully. Congress, as you know, has passed a law making it unlawful for us to solicit money from corporations. We must depend upon the contributions of individual voters. If every Republican in this Western Division would contribute one dollar to the campaign fund, we will be able to do all the things that the voters want done; we will be able to elect Taft and Sherman. Will you help? If so, please send one dollar to the chairman of your State Finance Committee, whose name appears in the list following, or send it direct to me and you will receive the official receipt of the Republican National Committee.

Respectfully,
FRED W. UPHAM,
Assistant Treasurer.

Contributions may be sent by check or money order to any of the following named chairmen of the various State finance committees:
Colorado, Hon. Whitney Newton, Denver.
Idaho, Hon. Frank F. Johnson, Wallace.
Illinois, Col. Frederick H. Smith, Peoria.
Iowa, Hon. Lafayette Young, Des Moines.
Kansas, Hon. Frank E. Grimes, Topeka.
Michigan, Hon. John N. Bagley, Detroit.
Missouri, Hon. O. L. Whitelaw, 400 North Second street, St. Louis.
Montana, Hon. Thomas A. Marlow, Helena.
Nebraska, Hon. John C. Wharton, Omaha.
New Mexico, Hon. J. W. Reynolds, Santa Fe.
North Dakota, Hon. James A. Buchanan, Buchanan.
Oregon, Dr. H. W. Coe, Portland.
South Dakota, Hon. O. W. Thompson, Vermillion.
Washington, Hon. James D. Hoge, Seattle.
Or to Fred W. Upham, Assistant Treasurer, 234 Michigan avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Summary of Wages Earned

In Thirteen Different Trades in the United States and Europe.					
	U. S. A.	Great Britain.	France.	Germany.	Belgium.
Blacksmiths' weekly wage...	\$ 16.52	\$ 9.74	\$ 9.12	\$ 6.92	
Rollermakers' weekly wage...	15.95	9.63	8.14	6.29	\$ 4.21
Bricklayers' weekly wage...	26.26	9.80	6.86	6.87	4.03
Carpenters' weekly wage...	17.79	10.03	7.84	6.44	3.82
Compositors' weekly wage...	22.33	8.87	6.51	7.05	4.77
Hod carriers' weekly wage...	13.74	6.00	4.63	4.07	2.67
Iron moulders' weekly wage...	17.30	10.15	7.46	6.50	3.94
Laborers' weekly wage...	9.38	5.70	5.40	4.48	3.07
Machinists' weekly wage...	15.15	9.20	7.42	7.33	4.26
Painters' weekly wage...	16.90	8.69	6.14	5.85	3.26
Plumbers' weekly wage...	21.70	9.98	7.35	5.82	3.84
Stonemasons' weekly wage...	20.70	9.77	7.09	5.79	3.35
Stonemasons' weekly wage...	22.80	10.39	7.24	6.64	4.22
Total	\$236.61	\$118.31	\$90.50	\$79.30	\$40.30
Average weekly wage.....	\$ 18.20	\$ 9.10	\$ 6.90	\$ 6.10	\$ 3.69

IN OTHER WORDS

In the United States for every \$1.00 a man earns in the 13 trades—
He earns 50 cents in Great Britain
He earns 38 cents in France
He earns 34 cents in Germany
He earns 20 cents in Belgium

—Taking the 4 European countries and averaging them—for every \$1.00 the American workman earns under Republican protection.

THE EUROPEAN WORKMAN EARNS 36 CENTS.

TAFT AND EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY.

His Decision in the "Voight Case" Forerunner of Present Humane Statute.

A striking service to humanity which William H. Taft rendered in his judicial career is recalled by Eugene F. Ware, former Commissioner of Pensions, in a letter to the Kansas City Star. Mr. Ware refers to what was known as the "Voight case," which was decided by Judge Taft in 1897. Judge Taft's decision, although overruled by the United States Supreme Court, is really the pioneer of a section of the present employers' liability law, which was passed through the efforts of President Roosevelt and a Republican Congress, and approved April 22, 1908.

Voight was an express messenger who, to get his job, had to sign an agreement releasing the express company from liability in case he was injured or killed. The express company

had a contract with the railroad exempting the railroad from liability in the event of injury to an express messenger. Voight was severely injured, and sued the railroad for damages on the ground of gross negligence, arguing that the railroad company could not make a contract evading its responsibility.

Judge Taft gave Voight a judgment of \$6,000 and costs, holding that the express company had no right to make such contracts; that they were oppressive, unreasonable and unjust, and were against public policy, and further that the railroad company owed to the express messenger the same public duty which it owed to a passenger.

The path blazed out by Judge Taft was followed in the new law referred to, which provides "That any contract, rule, regulation or device whatsoever, the purpose or intent of which shall be to enable any common carrier to exempt itself from any liability created by this act, shall to that extent be void."

ORGANIZED LABOR SUPPORTS TAFT.

Majority of the Real Leaders and Workers Will Vote for Their Real Friends.

No Longer Any Doubt But That Taft Will Get the Majority of Labor Votes Despite the Unscrupulous Fight Made by Gompers in Behalf of the Democratic Bosses.

Leaders of organized labor are opposed to Samuel Gompers in his efforts to deliver the labor vote to Bryan, and there is every indication that Taft will get the votes of most laboring men. At least three of the most influential vice-presidents of the American Federation of Labor evidently disagree with Gompers.

One of the men who called on President Roosevelt recently gave assurance that John Mitchell is not for Bryan, as intimated in a telegram alleged to be from him published in the last two days. He declared on authority, said to be that of Mr. Mitchell himself, that the noted labor leader did not write any telegram putting himself in the Bryan column. The telegram is said to be a fabrication.

James Duncan, first vice-president of the American Federation of Labor, next in authority to Gompers and a man of great influence in the organization, has written a letter to Willis Moore, chief of the weather bureau, pointedly antagonizing the attitude of Mr. Gompers and asserting that each individual should be allowed to vote without pressure from any one.

Daniel Keefe, sixth vice-president of the federation and president of the Longshoremen's union, is out for Taft and working hard for him. Keefe advises labor people to vote for Taft. Thus three of the six vice-presidents under Mr. Gompers are either supporting Taft or are opposing any plan that will place the organization as a body against the Republican nominee. Mr. Keefe said recently:

"Bryan has not been endorsed for president by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor. Neither has any one the right to criticize a union man for voting for any other candidate for president. In fact I will vote for Taft."

Taft's True Attitude Understood.

The Labor World of Pittsburg says: "Every day it is becoming more and more apparent that the more the 'labor' record of Judge Taft is discussed the more does the fact shine forth that he is a real friend of labor. The truth has always been recognized by the intelligent and fair-minded trade union leaders and officials, many of whom have the courage to stand boldly out and declare themselves to this effect despite the fact that undue pressure is being exercised to subdue such declaration."

The United Mine Workers of America, the strongest organization numerically in the country, will not be bound by the political program of the American Federation of Labor, to support Bryan and the Democratic platform. In an official circular issued by T. L. Lewis, international president of the union, to the 300,000 members, he says the membership has intelligence enough to know how to vote without any advice from him and he will do nothing to influence their political preferences in any way.

"Public Beggar" Story Confirmed.

A campaign sensation was sprung at Wheeling, West Virginia, at a Republican rally when Honorable M. M. Garland of Pittsburg, former president of the Amalgamated Association, declared he was present when William Jennings Bryan stigmatized union labor leaders as "beggars" and labor unions as "nuisances" in 1893, when the Ways and Means Committee of the National House of Representatives was considering the original Wilson tariff bill.

William R. Fairley, of Alabama, for the last ten years a member of the executive board of the United Mine Workers, has come out with the statement that it was the duty of laboring men to vote for Taft and Sherman. His stand is a practical repudiation of the leadership of Samuel Gompers, and additional evidence that the attempt of Gompers to "deliver" the labor vote to Bryan is a dismal failure.

Among the well-known trade unionists of Pennsylvania is George W. Boyd of the Structural Ironworkers' Union. He is fearless in the declaration of his opinion and is always guided by what he absolutely believes to be the truth. He is a believer in W. H. Taft as a friend of labor.

Prominent Chicagoan Defies Gompers

In the Piano, Organ and Musical Instrument Workers' Official Journal Charles Dold, the editor, who was formerly president of the Chicago Federation of Labor, bitterly assails Samuel Gompers for his effort to deliver the union labor vote in this campaign. He criticizes in particular a circular issued by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, asking the wage-earners to contribute to the Democratic campaign fund. Two quotations from the editorial are sufficient to show what is thought of Gompers' effort:

"We have searched diligently for

some act or deed of the Democratic party justifying labor's support, but have been unable to find one.

"The most deplorable working condition in the United States, the lowest wages, the greatest illiteracy, are all to be found there under the Democratic regime of the 'Solid South.' And the 'Solid South' controls the Democratic party."

On behalf of the International Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paper Hangers a statement has been issued, saying "a man is known by the company he keeps, and Mr. Bryan has publicly chosen to associate himself with men with whose unsavory past he is quite familiar."

The Alton (Ill.) Glassblowers' union, the largest union in the American Bottle Blowers' association, has repudiated interference by Samuel Gompers, who advised the union to endorse Bryan for President, and summarily laid on the table the communication from President Gompers at their business meeting.

The president of Highland Lodge, Amalgamated Iron and Steel Workers, of Terre Haute, Ind., said his organization cannot join in partisan politics, and that it also turned down an appeal from Gompers sent from American federation headquarters for a contribution to the Democratic campaign fund.

Minnesota and Iowa for Taft.

Bryan is not to receive the solid labor vote of Minnesota. Contrary to the repeated predictions and efforts of Democratic labor leaders there appears to be a big split in the ranks of organized labor, and Taft will receive his due share of votes from the union men. Fifteen of the most prominent union men in Minneapolis have signed a circular letter declaring they take exception to the methods used by the Bryan element of the organizations, and many believe the labor men of the State will exercise their individual wills when voting and will cast their ballots for the Republican nominee.

There is every reason to believe that a movement has set in among the laboring classes of Iowa, the workers in the large industrial communities, towards Taft and the Republican ticket. Not only are the labor leaders who early in the campaign were advocating the election of Bryan less active in the support of the Democratic ticket, but many men less prominent but no less influential in the councils of the various labor organizations are openly counselling a more rigid scrutiny of party promises and records.

August A. Bablitz, secretary of the Central Labor Union of Lexington, Ky., urges his fellows to vote the Republican ticket in order to insure a continuation of prosperity.

BRYAN AGAINST WOOL GROWERS.

Proposed Policies of Democracy Would Wreck Wool Growing Industry.

McKinley was elected through a number of Rocky Mountain states which had voted for Cleveland. These states were Democratic because of the large mining population. They turned to McKinley on account of the severe punishment they had received by placing wool on the free list during the four years of the life of the Wilson Tariff act, which on the theory of free raw material swept away the duty upon wool, and this nearly destroyed the wool growing industry of the United States; and if it had not been saved by the Dingley act, which restored the McKinley duties upon wool, the industry by this time would have been wiped out in the United States. Bryan hopes to carry Wisconsin, which is a wool growing state, and the Rocky Mountain wool growing states which voted for Cleveland the last time. Apparently he expects the wool growers to overlook the fact that the Republican platform expresses and defines protection to American industries, particularly mentioning the farmer, who is a wool grower.

Bryan's election would be a menace to the wool grower in two ways. The Democratic party has defined its attitude toward wool as a raw material, although it is the finished product of the farmer. It takes a whole year to grow a fleece of wool, and in this climate, where sheep are fed in winter, they are fed crops, which represent labor and high-priced American labor, whereas the competitor of the American wool grower is the wool grower of the Southern Hemisphere (Australia, the Argentine Republic and South Africa), who has the advantage of perennial pasture, and owing to this advantage, the cost of wool growing is only one-half of that of the American wool grower who, in the states enumerated, have to feed their sheep in the winter.

Another way to destroy the American wool grower would be by the destruction of the American Woolen Company, which consumes 40 per cent of American wool, on the ground that it is a trust. The American Woolen Company is composed of what were formerly some of the largest mills of the United States. They are thus what Bryan would denominate a "trust," and as his platform boldly declares that the products of trusts should be put on the free list, he would destroy the market for what American wool would be left. Then, again, if, in order to strike at the trust, he removes the duty upon "manufacturers of wool," he destroys the other 60 per cent of the independent mills outside of the American Woolen Company, or, in other words, those that are not in the trust. The Bryan policy spells ruin alike to wool growers and wool manufacturers.—American Economist.