# POLITICAL TOPICS DISCUSSED BY VARIOUS CONTRIBUTORS

## Importance of the Election of William H. Taft

**The Main Issue Is Maintaining the Roosevelt-Taft Policies Regarding Corporations, Trusts and Predatory Wealth; Epitomized Record of Both Parties.**

PORTLAND, Oct. 27.—(To the Editor.)—The Republican party has always successfully grappled with great problems, never more so than in the Roosevelt - Taft policies concerning abuses growing out of increasing wealth and growth of combination. The fact that our present ills are products of prosperity, significantly distinguishes Republican policies, and times, from Democratic. The struggle between capital and labor is largely for the spoils of Republican prosperity. In the days of Cleveland it was a struggle for existence. The great material progress and remarkable wealth advancement in the last 12 years are unparalleled in this or any other country since McKinley first defeated Bryanism and the Republican party resumed power. A country of great things and of vast aggregations of capital, the problem has been to punish or eliminate abuses of wealth without extinguishing benefits arising from great material progress. To make our wonderful advancement subservient to the public good and general welfare of capital and people, to control evils but not to destroy what is beneficial, has been the great question for solution in recent Republican administrations.

It is too late to question advantages of industrial combinations. They are a necessity of modern economy and effectiveness. It has long been too late to argue against corporations or great railroads. They are a necessity. **The practical thing is not to rail at them or attempt to destroy them, but to prevent or minimize their abuse of power.** Regulate them and render them subservient to the interests of all.

Our growing combinations of capital designed to manufacture with greater economy are legitimate, and when intelligently controlled are the natural products of modern enterprise, and beneficial to the people, and in their competitive benefit the public has the advantage of saving operations, increased production and ultimate cheapening of prices.

When, however, they are not based on economic principles, or organized along purely selfish lines to restrict output, drive out competition and raise prices, public service is perverted and due benefit to all does not accrue. We do not wish to destroy corporations or economic aggregations along business principles, but to make them subserve useful purposes, and the public welfare. **It is the function of national and state law to define and punish all business wrongs without throttling business itself.**

* * *

Lines of progress lie not in arbitrary action proposed by Mr. Bryan, but in securing suitable publicity and strong supervision; the infliction of proper punishment and assured government regulation. These things certain, have deterrent influence to bring about lawfulness, and compliance with public sentiment.

To say that the country is helpless is to acknowledge the incapacity of Americans properly to deal by public sentiment and law with all situations as they arise.

**President Roosevelt and Judge Taft, his great inspirer and adviser, represent policies that are upbuilding and regulative.** On the contrary, Mr. Bryan's projects emphasize danger and destruction—not intentionally, but nevertheless effectively—**and therefore the necessity for defeat of Bryan and election of Taft to insure maintenance of wise, conservative business policies.**

Let us glance along the record. The history of the magnificent growth and progress of this country, since the Civil War, has been the record of the Republican party and its grand achievements.

Take railroad regulation. Formerly the means of transportation were poor, but the highways were free; now the means are admirable, but our great highways are private property. The question is how to have the railroads administered as private property, so as continuously to enlist great investments of capital seeking legitimate profit, and at the same time enhance the great public interests. All now agree that systematic improvements of our harbors, waterways and canals, whether actually carrying or not, will be great competitive regulators of rates by rail.

* * *

Supervisory law, which should govern rich and poor, and subserve all, is also a means of regulation of rates of all artificial lines built under eminent domain and charged with a great public trust for the public welfare.

To solve this problem with fairness and justice to all, state commissions were first inaugurated in Massachusetts, when Bryan was a mere lad. The great National Act, the Reagan-Cullum bill, was passed in 1887, when Mr. Bryan was a briefless lawyer.

Grave questions arose. The railroads insisted they were private property, to be administered solely for private profit. They claimed they had transportation to sell and could sell it as they chose. Abuses existed. Favored rates were given to favored shippers, who crowded their less favored competitors to the wall.

In an address before the American Bar Association in 1895, Judge Taft, a year before Mr. Bryan thought free silver the remedy for evils, laid down the fundamental anti-railroad trust principle that all these vast aggregations, with due regard for their private interests, were charged with a public trust of operation for the ultimate welfare of the people of this country.

Again in '96, Judge Taft, in the Addiston Steel & Pipe case, decided principles under which all the later prosecutions of trusts have been based in this country—a decision that is now a legal classic. While Solicitor-General in Harrison's administration, Judge Taft became intimately associated with Roosevelt, the civil service reformer; and Taft's influence on Roosevelt personally and continuously has been most effective. How much so, let words of President Roosevelt attest:

"When I became Governor of New York and confronted with new and perplexing problems, I turned instinctively to Taft. I knew that we approached public questions at the same angle, and I wished to benefit from his sane, fair judgment. * * * I have known him intimately for many years; we have worked for the same objects, with the same purposes and ideals.

**"I do not believe there could be found in all the country a man so well fitted to be President.** He is not only absolutely fearless, disinterested and upright, but he has the widest acquaintance with the Nation's needs, without and within, and the broadest sympathies with our citizens.

**"Mr. Taft stands against all privilege,** and pre-eminently for the broad principles of American citizenship, which lie at the foundation of our National well-being.

"There is no fight for decency and fair dealing which I have waged, in which I have not had his effective sympathy and support, and the policies for which I stand are his policies as much as mine.

"He will not favor a ruinous experiment like Government ownership of railways; **he will stand against any kind of confiscation of honestly acquired property,** but he will work effectively for the most efficient type of Government supervision and control of railways, so as to secure just and fair treatment of the people as a whole.

"What is here said as to his attitude on railroads applies to the whole question of the trusts."

* * *

Neither he nor Taft ever borrowed any policy from Mr. Bryan. In 1900, Mr. Bryan thought the paramount issue was imperialism, yet Roosevelt in 1902 was actually at work on the evils of predatory corporate wealth and the regulation of trusts.

In 1904, his principles were a railroad commission with power to ascertain and fix rates. Parker's platform characterized Roosevelt's policies as "arbitrary and spasmodic methods which * * * pervert the public mind with dread distrust and perturbation." Bryan supported Parker. Parker was afraid of the destruction of state rights, and like Cleveland, was apprehensive of exercise of National authority of regulation. In state rights, Cleveland's Attorney-General, Olney, as can be seen from Cleveland's message, saw a great lion in the pathway of enforcement of the Sherman anti-trust law, passed in the administration of Harrison—"inherent obstacles," he said, that would cause "all Federal legislation on that subject to fall short of its purposes." Cleveland and Olney were thoroughly imbued with the Jeffersonian idea as opposed to Hamiltonian principles of a nation strong enough to cope with any interstate question.

Cleveland, in 1884, thought tariff reform the remedy. Bryan, in '96, thought currency regulation the thing and in 1900, the reform of our colonial policy, and the granting of the rights of self-government to Filipinos not prepared for it.

Roosevelt, on the contrary, imbued with Taft's principles, said, in 1904, that the evil of great railroad encroachment must be remedied through a National commission with full power to act and fix rates, reasonable for capital and for the people. Roosevelt defeated Parker whom Bryan supported and commenced his great work in earnest. Bryan went to Europe. Over there he saw some country owning and running some railroad and when he came back, in a carefully prepared speech, came out squarely for government ownership as our only remedy. Roosevelt, in the meantime, under the inspiration and counsel of Taft, went steadily on in his policy that the strong arm of National law be asserted on trusts, and that National highways be administered for the interests of the people.

* * *

During the Cleveland administration in the very teeth of the Sherman law, large monopolistic corporations had been formed. In Harrison's time, some were so successfully prosecuted in their illegal agreements with each other that the trusts finally sought the benefits of combination and aggregation of corporations to eliminate all competition our country had sought to guarantee in the Sherman law.

Roosevelt, however, counseled by Taft, buckled on his armor and **won the first great victory in the famous Northern Securities case beating the great consolidation of the Northern Pacific and Great Northern Railroads,** and leaving them still subject to the operation of the Sherman law.

These were all Taft policies.

Then followed the act of 1906—the rate bill, establishing the right of the Federal Government through the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate railroad rates so that they should be reasonable. It also has operated, so far, as a mightly moral warning to the great corporations, and also to the great industrial combinations, that from this time on our statutes must not be ignored.

**Today there is practically no rebating, nor discriminating in favor of large shippers.** Judge Taft, years ago, learning that a receiver of the Toledo, St. Louis & Kansas City Railroad was allowing rebates, summoned him before the court with the result that the receiver resigned and the rebating stopped.

* * *

The Roosevelt-Taft policy always has been right and as President Roosevelt said in his message in 1902, "we are not hostile to corporations; we draw the line against misconduct, not against wealth; and in curbing or regulating them, we must be careful not to stop enterprise but to prevent misuse of power." This was great doctrine.

President Roosevelt followed with an attack on the Standard Oil and the great tobacco trust. He has been tireless in his efforts to serve the people; the beef, paper and drug trusts, the coal combinations, and various combinations of railroads and shippers, **have all felt the heavy hand of the law and have learned the lesson that National law is strong enough to compel a square deal.**

To regulate and control the great combinations and to destroy the evils of trusts **requires a strong government—the power of Hamilton rather than the weakness of Jefferson;** a government strong enough to deal with the vast combinations of capital like those of Standard Oil, the steel trust, the railroad combines, and every trust that does an interstate and monopoly business. In short, such a government as Roosevelt has given and Taft will continue.

Congress has worked in harmony with the President in the great measures enacted, and has embodied into law more of the recommendations of the President than has ever fallen to the lot of a chief executive.

**No investment in lawful business has been jeopardized, no fair and honest enterprise has been injured;** but wherever the constitutional power of the government reaches, **trusts are being regulated and curbed within lawful bounds,** as they never have been before, and the men of small capital are finding in the efficiency and skill of the National Department of Justice, a protection they never had before against the crushing effect of unlawful combinations.

* * *

In the face of this record, it is apparent how little there is in the false claims of Bryanism through Democracy which is now apparently aching to get into office to burst a lot of trusts. Our laws have had such deterring effects that pooling, rebating and discriminating have been almost abandoned, all having a marked effect on business methods.

Overcapitalization is being reached and retarded, and remember that so far Democracy has accomplished nothing; nothing in Cleveland's time, almost nothing in any of the Democratic sovereign states that have already had full control of corporations in their jurisdiction, or over the corporate creatures of their own state laws. **And remember that every line of legislation now on our statute books condemning trusts was enacted by Republicans.** The Democrats simply have resolved.

* * *

Mr. Bryan has ever been afraid of centralization, but now he has a new-fangled project for destroying trusts that out-Herods Herod himself in centralization of National power, viz: The fanciful one of Federal license up to 50 per cent and annihilation if they exceed it—never able it seems to get away from arbitrary figures. In 96 it was 16 to 1; now it is 25 per cent to 50 per cent.

If a trust controls only 49 per cent, it is to be licensed and let alone; if 51 per cent, off comes its head. Bryan's trusts and combinations may grow until they get 50 per cent fat and then he strangles them. Up to 50 per cent, it is all right, over 50 per cent, it is all wrong.

**The true principle is the Roosevelt-Taft Republican one of regulating and punishing violations but not to destroy any great potentiality for progress.**

Bryan's present platform remedy is impracticable as Governor Hughes and President Roosevelt each well illustrated and so eutopian that it too is certain to go glimmering with all his past theories.

**Republican policies are regulative and progressive; Bryan's destructive. Roosevelt and Taft would regulate and up build.** Bryan, like Samson in his blind rage, would extirpate and destroy the entire business in order to stamp out evils—pull down, as it were, the very pillars of the temple over our own heads.

Voters, read Roosevelt's letter to Bryan. Taft only will carry out the good work of Roosevelt policies.

The Roosevelt administration has borrowed nothing from and owes nothing to Bryanism. **What Mr. Bryan has that is good is not original; and what he has that is original is not good.** The Republicans have borrowed nothing from him that was his own and owe nothing for any sound principles that it had not of its own to apply. It certainly has never borrowed his free trade, nor his free silver, nor his currency fallacies, nor his undermining of the judiciary, nor his scuttling policy in the Philippines, not any of his Government ownership, and it is to be hoped that the people now want none of his abollshments of court injunctions, or destruction of Federal court authority in contempt enforcement of decrees and orders, nor arbitrary throttling of any progressive business which has grown up beyond the trade of its own state, and extended to 50 per cent of business elsewhere. If Mr. Bryan ever had any good thing that was original with him, that was worth borrowing, the people have never been able to discover or approve it. Fine man as he is in private, he is too erratic for public use. He is too risky. You can never tell where he will burst forth next. Even if he be a new Bryan, we have yet to learn that the leopard can change his spots. Embalm, cremate and bury Bryanism.

Vote for Taft and take no chance.

M. C. GEORGE.

## About National Insurance of Bank Deposits

**Proposition to Abolish State Banks; All National Banks to Create Insurance Fund; System of Inspection that Must Disclose Dishonesty in Officers.**

PORTLAND, Oct. 28.—(To the Editor.)—There has perhaps been as much said and written during the present campaign with regard to bank guarantee as any other one feature of the two platforms. Believing that neither party is quite right on this question, I am prompted to give my views.

The term, guarantee, as used by the Democratic party, is misleading in that it gives the impression that the Government is to undertake to guarantee the deposits, or, in some measure, stand back of them, which it is my understanding is not the case, but the proposition is to have a compulsory form of co-operative or mutual insurance on the part of National banks, which state banks can take advantage of. This latter feature I believe to be wrong. All banks should be National banks under the strictest Governmental supervision and control. Whether we have compulsory co-operative or mutual insurance of deposits on the part of the National banks or not, we should have some rigid and searching Governmental inspection and control of the National banks, and in recommending this I do not mean to imply that all, or any great percentage of banks or bank officials are dishonest or crooked or require such stringent regulation, but failures prove that some are, and to catch the few we will have to supervise and regulate them all.

To begin with, we should take all the bank failures in this country since the National banks were established and classify them as to causes of failure, and then provide a system of rules, regulations, examinations and audits for each one of these causes that would effectually check and prevent failure from such causes, that is, insofar as lies in our power. For example, we can recall several large bank failures in this country where it was found after the crash that the president, cashier or some other official having access to the bank's funds, had been using same in unlimited quantities for speculative purposes. Naturally there must be something in the bank to take the place of the cash when examinations are made; usually these have been found to be fictitious or forged notes. To prevent making use of absolutely fictitious paper, the banks could be required to have on file a commercial report from a reliable commercial agency, like Bradstreet or Dun, in all cases where the amount loaned to an individual, firm or corporation amounted to over a stated sum, say, for illustration, $1000.

It would be impossible to get these commercial reports on an absolutely fictitious name. Now, to prevent their stuffing a lot of forged paper into the note pouch to be gone over by the examiner, the signatures being forgeries of the names of good, responsible men, the examiner should, at each audit, mail to the maker of every note found in the bank a statement of the note, with instructions if not correct to notify the auditor in person at his private lockbox at the postoffice, which could be secured for the purpose This would effectually prevent these forgeries. Then, in addition to that, after the examiner or auditor had completed his audit, have him make a list of all the notes and securities, figuring in the assets, said list to be classified and arranged alphabetically, making as many copies of this list as there are directors of the bank. Let it be the duty of the auditor or examiner to personally place in the hands of each director a copy of said list. In case of a director being out of town so this could not be done, the auditor or examiner to mail said list to his residence or business address other than the bank. This would prevent the directors from making the claim after the bank had suspended that they did not know the bank was loaning the amounts they were to certain names; they could not help knowing. This is merely a suggestion as to methods that could be adopted with reasonable certainty of stopping or preventing, at least, the major portion of failure from such causes.

The classifying of all bank failures that we have had under the head of causes, would of course develop other causes than those cited, which could be treated in a similar manner and an effectual preventive provided for each cause. This system would, of course, cost more money to maintain than the present system of examination, but it would be much more efficient, and while there might be some failures under such a plan, they would be reduced to the minimum. There would still be some risk left as no system could be expected to be absolutely infallible, nor could we expect that the individual could be absolutely so. Some examiner or auditor might some time fail us and prove untrue to his trust, but this could be minimized by rotating the examiners from one district to another.

Now after reducing the liability of failure to the minimum, is it not wise that we should provide for a compulsory, co-operative or mutual plan of insuring depositors against loss from failure or suspension of National banks so supervised by the Government, this insurance to cover the little risk that is left after we have eliminated all we possibly can? I believe that it is, and I believe that our Republican candidate, Mr. Taft, thinks that it is, as in touching upon Bryan's proposed guaranty, as it is called, he says he does not approve of it in its present form, indicating that he would approve of a proper measure. A satisfactory deposit insurance plan must carry with it the most rigid audit and regulation of the banks.

Dealing with the principal objections that I have noted, reference to the insurance plan as a general proposition, the one entitled to the most consideration, is the one advanced by Mr. Taft himself, that in the form as proposed by the Democratic platform the bill would not bring the desired results. To handle the matter properly all the banks would have to be under the same strict supervision, consequently state banks could not be allowed to take advantage or participate in the plan, and as a matter of fact there should be no state banks. The claim that it would make bankers more reckless we would offset by a more rigid inspection of regulation as proposed, which would make them more careful than they are now. They would still have their own investment and interest in the bank, same as they have now. The bankers have claimed that the basis on which to permit them to operate is simply upon a basis of honor. This is all right and proves sufficient in the majority of cases, but it is the case where the honor is lacking that we are after, and the plan as proposed will not injure honor where honor exists.

Another contention that is made by some is that the good and honestly-conducted banks should not be compelled to pay for the loss and defalcations of the dishonest or poorly-conducted ones. This sounds good, but when they all have their doors open and are doing business, which are the good ones, and which are the bad ones? We do not know until one goes to pieces. A trusted employe who handles funds and is asked to give bond, might as well make the same contention, as it is the premiums from the honest employe that has to pay for the defalcations of the dishonest, but they are all honest until they are found to be dishonest. Another objection raised by some of the banks, particularly the larger ones, and those that feel safe in their own security, is that this form of insurance would make the small bank as strong and as safe so far as the depositor is concerned, as the larger one, and that the small bank would thereby draw deposits out of proportion to its capital. This we can overcome and should provide for in our present banking law, whether we have deposit insurance or not, in the following manner:

Provide a limit to the amount of deposits that a bank may accept; said limit to be based on its capital and surplus. Just for illustration, we will say that no bank shall accept deposits in the aggregate of more than ten times its capital and surplus. When its deposits run to ten times its capital and surplus it must increase its paid up capital stock or reject new accounts. I don't use this as a correct ratio of deposits to capital, but merely as an illustration. A safe and proper ratio could easily be arrived at. Now for additional reasons why we should provide a plan of insurance along the lines indicated, first reducing the possibility of failures to the minimum, we insure practically everything else imaginable where there is possibility of loss to the individual. We insure against fire; against accident, death, dishonesty; we insure our plate glass windows, our elevators; we insure practically everything in connection with our business interests, and these business interests are but the arteries of trade, while the banks constitute the very heart and center through which these arteries are supplied with their life blood. Anything that affects the heart, affects the whole organism. In the case of most of our losses, against which we insure, there is absolute loss to the community, the wiping out of actual value, as in case of fire, but in a bank suspension there is no actual loss to the community; no money has been wiped out of existence, there is as much as there was before, and in a case of this kind it should be easier to insure against loss than in a case where there is actual loss to the community. Furthermore in the case of these other classes of insurance which we employ, we have only the individual loss to count on. In this bank proposition, however, it is not so much that we desire to save the individual from loss of what money he may have deposited in a certain bank, that is not the real end sought after, though it is necessary to do that in order to reach the real objective point, which is to make the depositor feel so absolutely safe and secure in his funds deposited in our National banks that no matter what may happen his mind is absolutely undisturbed.

There is no possibility of a panicky condition in his mind, causing depositors to run the banks and the banks to close their doors. In addition to this, there would be great advantage in the banker feeling that absolute security from runs, which would make him feel it not necessary to carry from 40 to 50 per cent of the deposits on hand, as many of the banks are doing today, and the interest on the difference between the reserve now carried and that necessary under conditions of absolute security to depositor and banker, plus the interest on additional deposits, which would be drawn from safety deposit vaults, tin cans, old wallets and stockings would more than pay the slight insurance premium, so that in reality we would have the absolute security to the individual depositor, banker, business interests and the community at large without actual cost to any of these interests.

As a plan of insurance, the following would seem to cover all requirements. Take the entire period that our banks have been in existence and get a ratio of losses to depositors. Do the same for the last 20 years; the last 15 years, which period (15 years), would cover '93 and 1907; also take the last 10 years. Whichever period shows the greatest percentage or ratio of losses to deposits, use as a basis; add 50 per cent for safety and in this way fix a premium ratio that all National Banks will pay in to the Controller of the Currency, to be by him held as a fund for the liquidation of suspended banks. Immediately upon the suspension of a bank, let the Controller of the Currency take charge, and immediately upon proof of claim of depositors, pay the claim in cash. Then the insurance fund stands in the depositor's place, and the bank is liquidated and the fund repaid from the assets of the bank as far as possible. If there is a deficit after using up all the assets of the bank, the stockholders still have to come in for an extra assessment, as at the present time. In the event there is a surplus of assets after the fund has been repaid, the surplus, of course, belongs to the stockholders. Should there at any time be an insufficient amount in the fund to take care of suspended banks, the Controller of the Currency to have power and authority to levy a pro rata assessment upon all National Banks to cover the deficiency.

As to this plan of mutual insurance, it is the plan under which the lowest fire rates in the country are written—a plan whereby the risk, or possibility of loss is reduced to the minimum, by providing every possible safeguard, and then providing a mutual insurance plan to cover the small risk that is left.

As to the advisability of this insurance as compared with fire insurance, or any other kind of insurance that we have today, there is ten times more reason for this kind of insurance than for any other class of insurance that we have, because trouble and loss and fear of loss among our banks cause widespread contraction of credit, and to a greater or less extent paralyzes every avenue of trade, whereas these other classes of losses we insure against are largely local and individual.

There is one thing that presents itself to my mind as a fair illustration of our present condition along this line, and that would be to see one of the knights of old go to battle with steel armor over his entire body excepting over his heart; that laid bare and his shield on his right arm.

In conclusion, I am a Republican; have always been, and shall vote that way at the forthcoming election, as I believe the interests of the country will be best served in Republican hands, including the providing of a bill somewhat along the lines indicated, to properly protect depositors, bankers and the business interests of the country at large from the serious results following the disturbing of confidence in our financial insitution.

H. W. MITCHELL.

## Increase Power of the Nation

**Only Hope Is in Taft's Election. Then Trusts Will Be Curbed.**

PORTLAND, Oct. 29.—(To the Editor.)—As an independent voter and one who has, by force of circumstances, kept well informed on the course of events, I may be able to help others by telling why I intend to vote for Mr. Taft. That is my excuse for writing.

I believe that government should be administered and laws made in the interests of all the people—not some laws for the capitalists, others for the bankers, others for the manufacturers, farmers, workingmen. Therefore, it was with disgust that I saw railroads ignoring any laws which did not suit them, violating conditions of land grants, granting rebates, driving some men out of business and helping others to create monopolies; land speculators hiring men by wholesale to commit perjury; trusts defying the laws against monopoly; manufacturers securing the imposition of an exorbitant import tax in order to enhance their profits and enable them to capitalize the extra profit and sell stock accordingly; officeholders using their office to rob the people as the postal officials did; workingmen resorting to dynamite and brutality in order to even things up for the violations of law perpetrated by their employers.

This was the condition when President Roosevelt took office. He has enforced laws against railroads so that they now admit that rebating is a crime; he has begun suit to forfeit land grants, the terms of which were violated; he has put life into the anti-trust law; he has sent the land thieves and the postal thieves to the penitentiary; he has championed the just demands of workingmen and resisted their unjust demands; he has warned them that lawlessness on the part of capital is no excuse for lawlessness on their part.

What Roosevelt has begun, Taft will carry on. Taft has been Roosevelt's right-hand man for years. Every act of Roosevelt's for the people must have had Taft's approval. The suggestion that Taft is a mere echo of Roosevelt is preposterous when one considers what he has done. His record as Judge and as Governor of the Philippine Islands—long before he became a lieutenant of Roosevelt—proves that he has a mind and will of his own; that he is no man's man, but is his own man. The conclusion is far more reasonable that he worked with Roosevelt because they were men of like mind.

But we are told that the Republican convention refused to include in its platform some of the distinctive Roosevelt ideas and that Taft is running on that platform. My answer is that Taft will do as Roosevelt did. Roosevelt forced his party to get ahead of its platform on railroad rates, trust prosecutions, meat inspection, pure food, protection to life on railroads. He had it half educated up to the point of thorough regulation of railroad securities and corporations, income and inheritance taxes, prohibition of child and female labor, removal of the abuse of injunctions without granting to labor rights which are not granted to others. Taft must have been heart and soul with him in this work or the two men could not have pulled together. Taft will carry his party beyond that platform. He will have to fight Aldrich, Cannon and all the slaves of the plutocracy, but he will force his progressive measures on them and all the rest of his party, just as Roosevelt did. He has been hailed as a radical by Senator La Follette, who, as even Bryan admits, is a faithful public servant and who is not likely to be deceived in the man.

Then why are the plutocrats supporting Taft? Assume that they are and, if they are it is only a lukewarm support. What is the alternative before them? To support Bryan, who has a new issue every six months and he'er a true one. They at least know what to expect from Taft, for he is a man of clearly defined principles, the effects of which "the interests" can foresee. But what can they expect of a man who takes up free silver, then anti-imperialism, then Government ownership, then guaranteed bank deposits and, when he finds these theories cannot win, becomes silent about them, though never openly retracting any of them? The plutocrats have no more love for Taft than they have for Roosevelt, but they would rather take Taft's medicine, knowing the worst about it, than run the risk with the mysterious doses Bryan concocts for them.

But how about tariff revision? In principle I am a free trader and believe a revenue tariff the only one for which there is any excuse. Then how are we to gain that goal? I have seen the adoption of one Democratic tariff reform bill and it was a monstrosity. The same elements in the Democratic party which deformed the Wilson bill are ready and able to do the same mischief again. Should they fail, then the most radical tariff reformers would cut the tariff so deep at one stroke as to cause business convulsions. Free trader as I am, I do not believe this would be in the public interest. The transition from the protective to the revenue basis should be gradual, so that business may adjust itself to the change without too violent a shock. Taft and the progressive Republicans propose a moderate revision with reciprocity provisions which would widen our foreign market. They will have a struggle with the standpatters, but will wring something from the fists of that faction. The manufacturers will find that they thrive under the reduced tariff and will cry for more of the same kind of medicine. Taft's revision may be the first step to converting the Republican party to thorough tariff reform. The Democrats had their chance in 1894 and made a botch of the job; now let the Republicans try.

But there is a reason for supporting Mr. Taft far more fundamental than any issue which has come to the surface in this campaign. The Republican party sets the Nation above the state; the Democratic party, with its state rights doctrine, sets the state above the Nation. I am convinced that the only hope of enforcing submission to the law by rich and poor alike and of securing such changes in the law as will abolish special privilege and secure equal opportunity for all is the enlargement of the National power. Trusts play the Nation and the states against one another so effectively that they do as they please. The only hope of effective control is in exclusive Federal incorporation and Federal control of all corporations doing interstate business and surrender of necessary powers by the states to the Nation. It is reasonable to expect something in this direction from the Republican party, for such a policy is in accord with its traditions. The Democratic party could not pass such measures without being false to its traditions. Mr. Taft, as President, can be expected to exert to the utmost all the powers the Nation already possesses for curbing the "malefactors of great wealth." If those powers are insufficient he will demonstrate that fact so plainly by his own course that the people will back up his demand for greater powers and Congress dare not refuse to submit the necessary amendments to the states.

These seem to me sufficient reasons why a believer in a strong National Government conducted in the interest of the whole people and not of any special interest should vote for Mr. Taft. Of course, in doing so he cannot help voting for Mr. Sherman—but let us hope that Mr. Taft will live out his four years and then no mischief can result.

HENRY LAURENCE.

### WHY BRYAN WILL BE DEFEATED

**Neither He Nor His Party Brave Enough to Espouse Prohibition.**

ALBANY, Or., Oct. 28.—(To the Editor.)—I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but for months have had the impression, amounting near to a conviction, that Mr. Taft will be elected President. If I am not mistaken, a number of the political leaders in the South declared after the Presidential election of 1904 that they would never go into another Presidential campaign.

With this declaration in memory and with the South so largely devoted to prohibition, there were some of us who felt quite sure that this sentiment would demand recognition at the Democratic National convention at Denver. The thought must have been burning in the minds of the Southern delegates, but its expression was smothered. Had the Democratic platform embodied a prohibition plank, there probably would have been no candidates nominated by the Prohibition party.

Of course, the indorsement of prohibition by the Democratic party would likely have alienated the liquor vote, but this would have been more than made up by Republican prohibitionists voting for Bryan, and he would have been quite sure of election, at least much more so than is now the case, for all many of his adherents are so sanguine.

With a more telling defeat than in 1904, because so nearly an even contest, the South will assert herself, and demand in 1912 recognition of the issue that is uppermost in her mind today, and that in four more years will have grown to much larger proportions, and aided by a like growth of prohibition sentiment all over our America's vast dominions will make that principle the dominating issue in American politics, championed by a party looking beyond material interests and seeking the glory of God and the highest uplift and truest welfare that pertains to a righteous citizenship. There will then be no need to repeat the call sounded forth from the heights of Carmel by Jehovah's grandest prophet, "How long halt ye between two opinions?" (I Kings 18-21), as to a choice, as we now apply it, not as between the two leading parties, but as between them and the Prohibition party. There is much to confirm the opinion of our candidate, Eugene W. Chafin, that the leading party that suffers defeat this year will cease to be.

The Prohibition party is the most likely of any to succeed it, though its name may be changed somewhat.

Whatever the name, it will place men in power favoring state and National prohibition, and who will enforce the laws so faithfully that there will no longer be heard the unmanly cry "Prohibition is a failure." I hope to see my native Oregon leading the van in the triumphal procession of a Nation redeemed from a thralldom worse than human slavery.

CYRUS HAMLIN WALKER.

## Grand Army and Mr. Bryan

**Why Should Any Old Soldier Vote for the Democratic Candidate?**

PORTLAND, Oct. 29.—(To the Editor.)—For my life I can see no good reason why any old soldier who fought in the War of the Rebellion from '61 to '65 can vote for Mr. Bryan. The evening paper supporting Bryan a short time ago had a statement from a straw-vote canvasser that old soldiers were unanimous for Bryan. Lest some may be deceived as to the truth of that statement, the writer knows it is an exaggeration. I might say "hot air." The truth is, only one in ten of the old soldiers will vote for Mr. Bryan. How can any of them who fought for the Union to make this a Nation do otherwise than support Mr. Taft and the Republican nominees? All of the veterans should be opposed to state rights, as advocated by Bryan and Jefferson. When he votes for Bryan he advocates state rights, and state rights means disunion.

There are persons in the vicinity of Portland who knew Mr. Bryan's father at Salem, Ill., that during the war he belonged to the Knights of the Golden Circle, prayed devoutly for the success of the Southern Confederacy. In 1864 for treasonable language and vilifying President Lincoln and his "Army hirelings," he came near being mobbed.

It will be asked what has this to do with W. J. Bryan, his son? It is this: "Like father, like son," in a large measure.

When the first opportunity was afforded W. J. Bryan to show his regard for the memory of Jefferson Davis in a conspicuous manner, he accepted an invitation of the committee on arrangements to be present at the dedication and unveiling of the monument in honor of the memory of Jefferson Davis, President of the Southern Confederacy, at Richmond, Va., about two years ago.

The dispatches tell us that Mr. Bryan was present, but did not make a speech. What was he there for? Comment unnecessary. Z. M. PARVIN.

Company D, Sixty-fourth Illinois Volunteers.

### Which the Dangerous Imperialist?

HEPPNER, Or., Oct. 27.—(To the Editor.)—A question: Please tell us which is the most dangerous imperialist, the one who, though certain that he has the affections of the people, refuses a third term, although it would be only his second elective one, or the one who, twice voted down by immense majorities, still persists in imposing upon a sensible Nation his conceited personality and the moving pictures of his absurd nonsense?

Probably W. J. B., if beaten at the polls a fourth or fifth time, would excuse himself, like the schoolboy we all heard of, who, coming from the creek on Sunday, a fishrod on his shoulder, and being met by his horrified minister's exclamation: "Oh, Charley, how could you?" said, "Oh, mister, I did not catch any."

LOUIS VORUZ.

### PLAGUE OF BLATANT DEMAGOGY

**What May Reasonably Be Expected if Bryan Should Be Chosen.**

HOOD RIVER, Or., Oct. 29.—(To the Editor.)—How strange it is indeed that every Bryanite is trying to lull us to sleep by saying that "nothing is going to happen if Bryan is elected. Everything will go on as smoothly as before," they say. If they believe what they are telling us, they are surely depending on our Republican Congress to serve as a bulwark against Bryan's and their own known radicalism.

"Nothing happened" during Cleveland's administration except a continuation of a high order of business and common sense, and see how the Bryanites hated him, and still hate his memory. Will they be content to have Bryan act as moderately and as sensibly as Cleveland did? Never! If Bryan is elected the country will be afflicted for the next four years or more with the worst pestilence of blatant demagogy and of attempts to force revolutionary legislation that our people have ever known.

R. E. HARBISON.

### DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF '64

**How the Party of Bryan Denounced the Patriotic Work of Lincoln.**

CENTRALIA, Wash., Oct. 27.—(To the Editor.)—Will you please publish enough of the Democratic platform of 1864 to show what they said of President Lincoln at that time?

Now the Democrats of the North are praising and eulogizing Lincoln to the skies, and some of them contend that they gave him only praise in the '60s. I was a soldier in the Civil War, and I remember how the Democrats abused Lincoln at that time. Nothing was too mean for a Democrat to say of "Old Abe" Lincoln. I also remember that the murder of Lincoln was attributed to the evil influence of the Northern Democrats, the "Copperheads," and the Knights of the Golden Circle. They were not howling for 16 to 1 then.

A. M. BARNETT.

This is the most pertinent plank in the Democratic National platform for 1864:

Resolved, That this convention does explicitly declare, as the sense of the American people, that, after four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war, during which, under the pretense of a military necessity of a war power higher than the Constitution, the Constitution itself has been disregarded in every part, and public liberty and private right alike trodden down, and the material prosperity of the country essentially impaired, justice, humanity, liberty and the public welfare demand that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities, with a view to an ultimate convention of all the states, or other peaceable means to the end that at the earliest practicable moment peace may be restored on the basis of the Federal Union of the States.

### AUTOIST HAS VANISHED

**Fears for Safety of Hansen, Round-World Racer.**

NEW YORK, Oct. 31.—The Norwegian Consul-General in New York, Christopher Ravn, has asked for assistance in an effort to find the whereabouts of Captain Hans Hansen, one of the men who took part in the recent automobile race around the world. Hansen started from New York in the French car, but left it in Chicago and later joined the American car and guided it across Siberia. On his arrival in Paris much feeling was expressed against him, and he was even threatened, it is said, because of his leaving the French car and assisting the American car to victory.

Members of the party who are now in New York state that they last saw Hansen in Paris when the party broke up after the race. At that time he had a large sum of money in his possession, and intended to go to Tomsk, Siberia, where his wife and child reside. Now it develops that he has not reached that city and his relatives are unable to find trace of him. Hansen has been a sailor and soldier of fortune, having made many trips in various out-of-the-way corners of the world.