

Senator Hanna recently declared that there are no monopolies save those which are protected by patents. The Bangor (Ma.) Commercial asks Senator Hanna to produce the "copyright" on the cow for the benefit of the packing houses monopoly; but at the latest writing, Senator Hanna had not responded to the interesting request.

**Where Is the Copyright?**

The republican papers are making much ado over a recommendation made by Charles A. Conant, who visited the Philippines as a representative of the administration, to the effect that mortgage loans be guaranteed by the government. Mr. Conant insists that some means should be adopted for aiding the farmers. It has not been very many years since the republican party denounced the very plain suggestion by Mr. Conant as a crazy populist scheme.

**A Populist Scheme.**

Governor Odell of New York being asked as to the platform upon which he is to stand for re-election, replied: "You see, I shall just be an ordinary candidate, and will have to accept the platform that is given me." The republican party made no mistake in selecting Mr. Odell as its representative. The candidate whose opinions on public questions are so unsettled that he would have to accept the platform that is given him has peculiar claims upon the republican party.

**Anything to Get Office.**

A New York citizen, replying to the World's request for an opinion on the suggestion that the coal strike be submitted to arbitration, said that arbitration meant "the arrival at a fair settlement without lessening the pride of judgment of individuals or corporations concerning the subject in dispute." The republican governor of Nebraska defined arbitration as "simply a crutch on which organized anarchy is willing to lean for support after it has found lawlessness of no avail, and while it may contain some merit, it is its subtle progeny, and is of kindred parentage."

**Two Interesting Definitions.**

When J. Pierpont Morgan returned from his European trip, he was asked if he would make an effort to settle the coal strike. Mr. Morgan in turn inquired: "What action can I take?" The New York World provides an interesting suggestion to the great trust organizer when it says: "When there was a presidential election pending, in face of a similar strike two years ago, the great financier of the mergers and the trusts needed no advice as to what action he could take. He gave the word and the operators yielded a 10 per cent advance in wages. Aside from politics, is not the public need of a settlement far greater now?"

**Try It, Mr. Morgan, Try It.**

The attention of the powers that be is directed to the Philadelphia Record, a republican organ that has had recently one or two lucid intervals. The Record says: "There is not a housewife in the land who does not know that the cost of living has increased in the past few years and that the increase has been at a higher ratio than any increase of wages. When the republican congressional campaign committee affirms that the cost of living is not greater than formerly, it evidently refers to the necessities of the trust magnates or millionaires. Perhaps if we consider automobiles, diamonds, Paris dresses, divorces, hot birds and cold bottles, and the like, as among the things which people must have, the aggregate cost is not

**Surely This is Treason.**

greater than formerly. When, however, the question is limited to the needs of people of moderate incomes, it is found that the chances of saving something out of the wages or salary have been diminished. This is the conclusion of the bureau of statistics in Massachusetts which has made a practical and thorough examination of the subject. It is unfortunate for the republican committee that the report could not be suppressed, for it will go far toward blocking the trust-defending campaign."

The Buffalo (N. Y.) Express, a republican paper, declares: "Only the hotheads seriously demand that trusts be legislated out of existence. Fortunately there is not the slightest chance that they will have their way." If the people who are now suffering under the exactions of the trusts and protesting because of their impositions, comprise the "hotheads" of the country, then it must be true that the majority of the American people come under that designation. It is significant that every time a monopoly is assailed, republican papers regard it as their duty to rush to the monopoly's defense.

**"Hotheads" Oppose Trusts.**

"Many of the industries of this country have outgrown their infancy and we favor a revision of the tariff without unreasonable delay, which will place upon the free list every article and product controlled by any monopoly and such other articles and products as are beyond the need of protection." This was the declaration of the Idaho republican state convention. Secretary Shaw interpreted the tariff plank in the Iowa republican platform to suit the administration's views, but he has so far made no response to the suggestion that he interpret the plank in the Idaho republican platform.

**Prepare the Chains at Once.**

Representative Eddy of Minnesota declares in an interview that tariff revision is a burning issue in the west. He says that this sentiment is very strong in every republican state west of the Alleghany mountains. He declares, however, that republicans will control the next house and by a larger majority than the last. What are the republicans of these states west of the Alleghany mountains doing with this "burning issue" when they go to the polls and vote for republican candidates for congress? Do they not know that there can be no tariff revision under the republican party? Has not the administration given, through Secretary Shaw, clear assurances to the republicans that there is no wisdom in tariff revision agitation and no necessity for tariff revision itself?

**Mr. Eddy's "Burning Issue."**

Some of the republicans find it difficult to agree on the tariff question. Mr. Babcock, chairman of the republican congressional committee, declared that it is a rule of trade that the surplus products must not be dumped on the home market to demoralize it. And in this way he justifies the fact that the protected manufacturers in this country sell their goods abroad for a smaller price than they demand at home. The Chicago Tribune, republican, while agreeing with Mr. Babcock that it would not be well to demoralize the home market, says: "The case is different when a manufacturer exacts from domestic consumers a price which is so high as to lessen the ability of the home market to buy his goods. If the surplus is due to the unwillingness of home buyers to purchase as largely at the unreasonably high price as they would at the reasonable price, the manufacturer is at fault and domestic consumers have just cause for complaint when goods are sold abroad by him at much

**Republicans and the Tariff.**

lower prices than at home. The protected American manufacturer owes his first duty to his home customers. A moral obligation rests on him to supply them with all the goods they are able to buy at reasonable prices. There are manufacturers who do not acknowledge this obligation, who restrict home sales by extortionate prices, and then dump on the foreign markets the surpluses they themselves have created. Congressman Babcock ignores the existence of such manufacturers. He did not ignore their existence a few months ago, when he was apparently anxious to legislate against them."

The Omaha Bee, a republican paper, approaches the danger line when it says: "The Standard Oil trust has advanced the price of gasoline 1 cent a gallon. That would seem very insignificant. The railroads proposed to advance the wheat rate 1 cent per 1,000 pounds. That also seems a trifling increase. But when these pennies all drop into the corporation slot they will mount into the millions and millions."

**"If This be Treason—"**

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, republican, says: "According to free traders, it takes the people seven years to forget the last era of calamity brought upon the country by a democratic tariff. The free traders are again warbling their soup-house ditty and charging all the political evils on earth upon a protective policy." The Globe-Democrat forgets that the McKinley bill went into effect October 1, 1890; that the Wilson bill did not go into effect until August, 1894, and that the greatest panic in recent history occurred under republican policies as exemplified in the famous McKinley bill.

**But Don't Forget The Dates.**

In his Vermont speech, Secretary Shaw said: "Away back in 1846 Daniel Webster, in the course of a three days' speech against that most unfortunate bill which repealed the protective tariff act which bore the signature of Old Tippecanoe, uttered this maxim: 'When there is work for the hands there will be bread for the teeth.'" There is in this country today plenty of work for the hands, but the recompense for that work has not by any means kept pace with the increased price of food; and although there is today work for the hands it cannot in truth be said that "there is bread for the teeth." Thousands of workingmen who were misled and deceived by the vision of "four years more of the full dinner pail" will bear testimony to this claim.

**Work and Bread.**

The Washington correspondent of the New York Evening Post prints a copy of the arbitration law of Pennsylvania and Pennsylvania's says that it is strange that no one has thought of appealing to that law for a settlement of the coal strike. The Pennsylvania law provides that either or both parties to differences between employers and employes may appeal to the court of common pleas to appoint a board of arbitration. The court is authorized to appoint such a board which is given power to send for persons and papers. When the board reaches a conclusion by a majority vote, the result is to be certified to the court. While it is true that no penalty is attached to this law, if the court would be one-half so ready to exercise its powers under the rule of contempt in the arbitration proceedings as the federal courts are in exercising extraordinary powers under that rule against coal miners, there might be little difficulty in making the Pennsylvania arbitration law effective.

**Pennsylvania's Arbitration Law.**