

trusts, and annihilation of the trusts does not mean an annihilation of industry, it does not mean the closing of factories but simply means that no corporation shall own or control enough factories to give it a monopoly of the market, and annihilation of trusts would simply prevent a monopoly for the future, and require corporations now having monopoly to sell enough plants to restore the competitive system. The trust question, being a new question as compared with the tariff question, opinions are not so set upon it and it is much easier to convert a republican to the democratic position on the trust question than it is to convert him to the democratic position on the tariff question. It would be a fatal mistake for the party to refuse to make an appeal to the anti-trust republicans for they are much more numerous than the tariff reform republicans, and they are not so likely to insist upon the securing of anti-trust legislation from the republican leaders.

The sentiment in favor of railroad regulation is even more widespread than the sentiment against the trusts and this sentiment has been cultivated by the agitation in the federal courts and in the various state legislatures. It is not an exaggeration to say that a considerable majority of the republicans are in favor of effective railroad regulation and the democratic party can not afford to ignore this question merely to please those who are more interested in tariff reform than in railroad regulation. How could our party excuse itself if it attempted to follow the suggestion of railroad magnates and the railroad attorneys to the ignoring of this question which involves first, the present value of the railroads, second, the future issue of watered stock and third, the reduction of rates.

There is no inconsistency in the presentation of all of these questions in the same campaign, and fortunately a large majority of the democratic voters believe in the elimination of private monopoly, and in railroad regulation as well as in tariff reform. The three questions can not only be discussed together consistently but they can scarcely be discussed separately for the trusts have used both the railroad and the tariff wall for the building up of private monopoly.

There is an issue more fundamental than either the trust issue, or the tariff issue, or the railroad issue and it is involved in all of these issues, and this larger and more fundamental issue is this: Shall the government be administered by the people in the interest of the whole people, or shall it be administered for the benefit of a few and by those whom the few, through coercion and the corruption of politics, elevate to power. Shall the people rule is an issue which all people can understand. Shall this be a people's government or a government of syndicates, by syndicates and for syndicates? This is a question that demands attention. The trusts have made the government a government of a few, and for a few, just as the beneficiaries of the tariff have subordinated the welfare of eighty millions of people to the pecuniary interests of a comparatively few who are engaged in protected industries.

The railroad magnates have, in like manner, been permitted to prey upon the stockholders as well as the patrons of the road. On every subject that has come before congress, the republican leaders have taken the side of the classes against the masses until at last the public is aroused and the people ready to act.

The paramount issue, therefore, is the protection of all of the people who desire equal rights from the few who demand special privileges, and this issue is presented in every question which is before the public or is likely to come before the public. The few are interested in centralization; the many demand the preservation of the rights of the citizens. The few are interested in providing monopolies; the many demand the restoration of competition for the protection of the public. The few profit by a high tariff; the many demand that taxation shall be for purposes of revenue and not for the enrichment of a secondary class. The few grow rich by the issue of watered stock and fictitious capitalization and by the juggling of the values of railroads; the many demand that the railroads shall be conducted as quasi public enterprises with due regard to the interests of the stockholder and the patron. The few would make the wage earner the bond-servants of corporate masses; the many insist upon reasonable hours and reasonable compensation for those who toil and for trial by jury as well as impartial investigation of dispute between labor and capital. The few hope to coin money out of a colonial policy; the many—from principle, as well as because they pay the taxes and furnish the sons

for the army—demand the recognition of the American doctrine of self-government wherever the American flag floats. The few may accumulate enormous fortunes by the equipping of large armies and the building of large navies and the opening of a life service to a comparatively small part; the many prefer peace and honest friendship with all nations and the justice in government that will make force unnecessary.

It is favoritism for a part of the people or justice to the whole population, and no matter where you turn this issue presents itself. It is paramount because it is uppermost in the minds of the people and paramount also because it is embodied in all of the questions under consideration.

On this issue the democratic party must stand with the people and fight for the people. If between now and election time it can convince the public that it is worthy to be trusted by the people it will become the instrument of the people to secure the reforms, the need of which is now confessed, but the accomplishment of which can not be expected from republican leadership.



FORECASTS

In sending to the senate Governor Magoon's report, President Roosevelt said: "I am glad to be able to say that we can now definitely announce that by or before February 1, 1909, we shall have turned over the island to the president and congress to be elected next December by the people of Cuba."

Referring to this statement of the president the St. Louis Globe-Democrat (rep.) says: "Wise political prophets will not view very seriously that forecast which takes the United States out of Cuba by February 1, 1909, or at any other date in 1909."

It would be well if the Globe-Democrat and other republican papers could be equally frank on the republican promise to "revise the tariff after election." The Globe-Democrat's comment would be about like this: "Wise political prophets will not view very seriously that forecast which gives tariff revision by a party that derives its campaign funds from the tariff beneficiaries after the coming election—or indeed after any old election."



LET MR. PERKINS SET THE PACE

Writing in the Sioux City (Ia.) Journal, Editor George D. Perkins said: "Nothing is so exhilarating to the spirits of Mr. Bryan as the reports of republican family trouble. He is justified in believing that he knows what such trouble means. The scheming of one factional leader against another; the rough and tumble, the clenched fists, the bad blood, the passionate language—all this is better than a free lunch to the Nebraskan. It is diverting; it promises such state of feeling as shall open the lines for the royal passage of Mr. Bryan. The reasonable presumption is that Mr. Bryan and his party will find the situation somewhat different following the national conventions. He ought to be brought to face a different situation now."

Mr. Bryan is really a man of peace and to prove words by deeds he pleads for harmony among the republican brethren. As a good beginning Editor Perkins might call a halt upon the Sioux City Journal's policy of persistent attack upon Governor Cummins.



SUSTAINING A PRECEDENT

Congressman Clayton has introduced the following resolution: "Resolved, That the country is to be congratulated upon the recent declaration of the president of the United States, affirming the wisdom of the custom which limits the president to two terms, which declaration demonstrates that he, in common with all other patriotic Americans, recognizes that the precedent established by Washington and other presidents of the United States in retiring from the presidential office after their second term has become, by universal concurrence, a part of our republican system of government, and that any departure from this time-honored custom would be unwise, unpatriotic and fraught with peril to our free institutions."

This resolution was introduced on December 12, 1907; three days before Mr. Clayton had introduced a resolution expressing it as the opinion of the house that the precedent established by Washington and other presidents in retiring after a second term had by universal concurrence become a part of our republican system of government and that "any departure from

this time-honored custom would be unwise, unpatriotic and fraught with peril to our free institutions." Between the 9th and the 12th the president issued his statement announcing that he would adhere to the statement issued by him the night of the election to the effect that he would not be a candidate for another term.

Mr. Clayton's second resolution ought to be adopted by the house. The change in form makes it congratulatory rather than a warning to the president, but it is well that the house should go on record as opposing any departure from the precedent established in regard to the third term. While the resolution is not necessary in the president's case, it may have a salutary influence upon future presidents in case any of them are urged by their admirers to consider a third term.

It is fortunate that the position of congress can be expressed in a resolution applauding the president's determination rather than in a resolution that could be construed as a threat.

Two terms are enough for any president. There should be no third term under any circumstances. In fact, one term is enough and there are more people in this country who favor a one term presidency than there are who would favor a third term presidency. The enormous power in the hands of the president presents a temptation so great that the president himself should be protected against it. A man called upon to discharge the responsible duties of chief executive should not be in a position to use the authority which he has for the gratification of a personal ambition. It is the summit of human aspiration—so far as one aspires to political position—and when one reaches this summit he should free himself from every taint of selfishness or ambition and consecrate his official term to a patriotic endeavor to justify the confidence of his countrymen and to win the approval of those who conferred upon him this greatest of all distinctions which mortals can confer upon a fellow being.



INSTRUCT!

The press dispatches report that at the recent meeting of the democratic national committee an effort was made to have the committee pass a resolution against the instructions of delegates. Of course the effort failed, but the fact that such a resolution was suggested shows that we still have some very undemocratic men who call themselves democrats. Not instruct? Why not? Well, there are two reasons that might be urged against instructions. First, there is the aristocratic reason, namely, that the voters have not sense enough to know what they want. According to this view, the voters meet together and select delegates of "superior intelligence" (and with money enough to pay traveling expenses) to attend the convention and speak for them. If this view is the correct one then the adoption of platforms is a mistake for "a superior intelligence" could not be expected to be bound by a platform adopted by the "less intelligent" voters of the rank and file. This is the aristocratic position, and it will not appeal to any one who desires to be known as a democrat.

The democrat believes with Jefferson that the people have both the right to, and the capacity for, self government, and believing this he regards the representative—whether he be an official or a delegate—as the servant of those who elect him. The master—the people—has a right to tell the representative what to do and how to do it. This information is given first, in a platform which expresses the opinion of the voters on the issue involved and second, in instructions which express the desire of the voters in regard to the person or persons to be nominated.

Any man, claiming to be a democrat, who either denies the right of the voters to instruct or objects to being instructed ought to be left at home. No man is fit to be a democratic delegate who puts his own wishes above the wishes of those who elect him.

The second objection to instructions is that they prevent the delegation being used for trading purposes, but as trades are generally made for personal advantage rather than for the advantage of the voters the objection needs only to be stated—it answers itself.

The third objection to instructions is that they make it impossible for the delegates to betray those who elect them. This objection is never stated openly but it is the real objection with most of those who oppose instructions.

If the readers will examine the record of those who now oppose instructions they will find that most of them have favored instruc-