

duct was hoisted another 25 cents a ton. The anthracite coal trust has merely taken advantage of the people's necessities, knowing full well that there is nothing to hinder it from so doing. It has a monopoly of the market and experience has taught it that it has nothing to fear from the attorney general's department at Washington. The administration regards the election as an endorsement of the policy of non-interference and non-enforcement of the anti-trust laws already upon the statute books.

The situation is this. The coal trust knows that it can get the additional 25 cents a ton for its product, so it increases the price. The people have to have the coal. The trust adds nothing to the wages of its miners, and the increase of 25 cents per ton means an additional profit to the trust. There is no competition in the anthracite coal business. The trust controls most of the mines and all of the avenues of distribution. If the miners strike for a living wage the trust magnates merely starve the miners into submission and then make the public pay the loss. If it decides to meet the demands of the miners it merely adds the increased wages to the price the consumer must pay. When it is not engaged in robbing the miners it is robbing the public, and most of the time it is deliberately robbing both. It defies national and state laws, knowing full well that it has nothing to fear at Washington, and nothing to fear from the authorities of the most corrupt state government in the Union—Pennsylvania. Its insolence is colossal, its greed unbounded and its opportunities immense.

William R. Hearst has already presented to the legal department of the government evidence to convict the anthracite mine owners of criminal conspiracy under the Sherman anti-trust law, but while the people either freeze or submit to the trust's extortions, the legal department of the government moves leisurely along without making any apparent effort to be of service to its employers—the people.

The World's "Lesson"

The New York World in a recent editorial gives the presidential vote from 1864 up to and including the year 1904. Then it proceeds to draw a lesson from the returns. The entire editorial will be found upon another page of this issue.

The World says that the republican party may have lost one election by refusing to yield to its "populistic" elements, but that the democratic party "by yielding to these elements has lost three successive elections." The World, after having claimed credit for Judge Parker's nomination, after having urged him upon the party as just the man for the place, now doubts the wisdom of his nomination and is not sure "just how far Judge Parker was responsible for this disaster," (that is, the recent defeat), and then follows the statement that in the World's opinion "it is apparent that Mr. Cleveland would have made a better run." It asserts that "the slump really began in 1896 when the democratic party openly surrendered to the silver republicans, the populists and the advocates of wild-cat money in general."

The fact that Mr. Bryan, whom the World opposed, polled in 1896 946,000 votes more than Mr. Cleveland polled in 1892 or 1888 and 1,400,000 more than Mr. Cleveland polled in 1884 does not disturb the World at all. Even the fact that Mr. Parker polled something like a million and a quarter less than Mr. Bryan polled in 1900 does not jar the World's composure. It puts it aside with the statement that "the tragical rout of 1904 followed as a matter of course." If the World knew the "tragical rout" was to follow as a matter of course, why was it so insistent upon dictating the course of the party? In order to make its condemnation of the democratic party complete, it asserts that Judge Parker only polled 200,000 more votes than Cleveland polled twenty years before and says that this increase "marks twenty years of democratic progress."

The World thus ignores the progress the party made before that newspaper became the party's confidential adviser. It condemns the democratic convention for refusing to endorse unequivocally the gold standard, and declares that "the economic sins of a whole generation of greenbackers and free silverites have been visited upon Judge Parker." The World demanded that Judge Parker send the gold telegram which figured so conspicuously in the campaign, and after it was sent the World assumed that the party would receive the support of those whom it described during the campaign as independents and "sane democrats." During the campaign the World lost no opportunity to insult

the men who were willing to support the ticket in spite of Judge Parker's views on the money question. And on the Sunday before the election it published for pay a republican cartoon which covered almost an entire page.

Of all the papers that figured in the last campaign no paper played so contemptible, so despicable and so mercenary a part as the New York World. It first picked out the candidate, then it instructed him from day to day in a boisterous tone as to what he ought to do. It claimed credit for dictating his policy and then sold its columns to the republican committee to criticize the man whom it claimed to be supporting, and now when the election is over it calmly informs its readers that the "tragical rout of 1904 followed as a matter of course."

After this record the World has the impudence to pose as an adviser of the democratic party and to abuse those as "demagogic" who insist that the democratic party shall be democratic.

Before the democratic party takes any more advice from the New York World it ought to require the owner to give bond that the proprietor will not sell the paper to the opposition. The sooner the World announces itself a republican paper the sooner will the democratic party be relieved of a heavy load. It ought to follow the example of the Chicago Chronicle.

A New Life of Jackson

Colonel A. S. Colyar of Nashville, Tenn., has just issued through Marshall & Bruce, Publishers, of his home city, a two-volume edition of "The Life and Times of Andrew Jackson." The work is a really valuable addition to biographical literature and corrects many of the errors that have crept into print in regard to the first of the western presidents.

Colonel Colyar is a lawyer of great learning and high repute and he is also a student of the science of government. Having in addition a knowledge of military affairs and being an ardent admirer of Jackson he is in an excellent position to present an accurate review of the principal events in the life of his hero, who is described in the book as "Soldier—Statesman—and President."

Colonel Colyar presents a detailed account of Jackson's conduct upon the field, and in the realm of statesmanship. The account which he gives of the battle of New Orleans is especially interesting. It shows that instead of being a one-day engagement it really covered some two weeks. The wonderful victory of January 8, is really explained by the long drawn out battle that preceded it. The British landed just below New Orleans after dark on the evening of the 23rd of December, and Jackson as soon as he heard of it exclaimed: "By the Eternal, they shall not sleep on our soil," and went immediately to attack them with such force as he had. He did prevent their sleeping, and the skirmishes that followed each night so interrupted their repose that they entered the final battle already worn out from fatigue and loss of sleep. Colonel Colyar quotes English descriptions of the continuous engagement in support of his narrative.

Speaking from the standpoint of a friend Colonel Colyar refutes many of the slanderous stories that have been put in circulation by prejudiced biographers. All democrats who are preparing for active political work should secure a copy of Colyar's "Life and Times of Jackson."

Washington on Large Armies

Washington, in his farewell address, said: "Hence, likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments which, under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly inauspicious to republican liberty."

The words of Washington may well be recalled at this time, when our army is much larger than we need. It looks as if the republicans must either cut down expenses or increase taxes. The army would be a good place to begin.

One "Concrete" Instance

The Wall Street Journal is one of the republican papers that is pleading for "a revision of the tariff that not only aids in the extension of commerce but also removes some of those inequalities which now bear heavily upon American consumers and afford an over-measure of protection to certain American industries."

In reply to one of its editorials on this line

the Journal received a letter demanding a bill of particulars. The writer of that letter asked the Journal to give some specific instances by way of example, pointing out tariff duties which should be reduced. As "one specific, concrete instance," the Journal points to steel rails and its remarks are so interesting that liberal quotations are hereinafter made. The Journal says:

"The production of steel rails, has, therefore, increased from 996,983 in 1884 to 2,873,228 in 1903. In the same time the price has declined from \$30.75 per ton to \$28.00 per ton, while the duty has been reduced from \$17 to \$7.84 per ton. There have, however, been a number of fluctuations during these twenty years. For instance, the price advanced to \$37.08 in 1887, declined to \$17.62 in 1893, advanced to \$32.29 in 1900, fell to \$27.33 in 1901, and then advanced to \$28.00 which is the present price. It is of interest to note that with every reduction in the duty there has been an increase in the home production. For instance, the duty was reduced from \$28 to \$17 in 1883 and, while the immediate effect of this was to reduce the production from 1,148,000 to 959,000 tons, this falling off occurred in the lean years of 1884-5, and under the reduced rate of duty there was an increase in production to 2,101,000 tons in 1887. The present rate of duty of \$7.84 per ton has existed since 1894, and in that time the production has more than doubled. It is apparent from this that a reduction of duty will not necessarily cause a reduction in the domestic output. It is also clear that at least a part of the reduced duty will be reflected in lower prices to consumers.

"The price of steel rails at present is \$28 at the point of production. That is the price to domestic consumers. Mr. Schwab, lately president of the United States Steel corporation, and considered one of the greatest living experts on steel, has said that it cost \$12 per ton to manufacture steel rails. This statement of cost is reasonable. Assume that 60 per cent ore is used, the following may be taken as the items of cost per ton of ore: Royalty, 60 cents; mining, 40 cents; rail freight, 80 cents; lake freight, 75 cents; dock charge, 15 cents; rail freight to furnace, 90 cents; furnacing including coke, \$1.50; total, \$5.10.

"It takes five tons of 60 per cent ore to make three tons of iron. Consequently we get an indicated cost of \$8.50 per ton for the iron thus produced. Add to this \$3.50 per ton for conversion into rail and we get the \$12 that Mr. Schwab spoke of.

"There is, therefore, a profit of \$16 per ton or 133 per cent at the present price. It is clear that the rate of duty on foreign made steels is an over-measure of protection. For even if the duty were abolished altogether, and \$7.85 per ton taken from the present market price, there would still be a large margin of profit.

"Moreover, it is quite notorious that American made steel rails are sold abroad at a price much less than that at which they are marketed in the United States. Some time ago American steel rails, which sold at Pittsburg, in the United States, at \$28 per ton, were sold in Beirut, Syria, at \$22 per ton. Speaking broadly, the foreign price of American steel rails is about 25 per cent less than the price to the American consumer.

"Here is a specific, concrete instance, and as the iron and steel trade is a basic trade, and as the price of iron and steel affects in large measure the prices of all other commodities, it would appear that here was an opportunity for a reduction in the tariff that would operate to the advantage both of the foreign and the home market, with gain to the consumer, without material loss to the producer and without danger to the policy of protection."

Evidently the Journal would be content with a comparatively slight reduction in the steel rail duty. But what reason has the Journal or any other republican newspaper to expect any tariff revision on the face of protests against such revision made by concerns whose special privileges will be taken from them and concerns which, in the effort to maintain those special privileges, have provided the republican party with its campaign funds?

Burning Questions

The Chicago Tribune speaks of the tariff question as a burning question and says that "the people will not be content with a stand-pat policy." As the republican party went into the campaign with a platform that promised no tariff reform and won a great victory it seems a little inconsistent for a republican paper to say that "the people will not be content with a stand-pat policy." The republicans generally consider the election as an