

tail dealers buy from both the railroads and the independents and their price has to be on an average arrived at through consideration of the cost prices—the railroad cost of \$5 and the independent price of \$10, or whatever it may be.

"The railroads could enforce a fixed retail price only by selling enough to one retailer to free him from the necessity of buying coal from the independents. This is impracticable for the reason that a retailer who would sell coal at \$6 a ton would have demands made upon him for 10,000 tons a day, which no one railroad could meet."

"Prices advanced yesterday in nearly every yard in the city as soon as the dealers heard of the arbitrary action agreed upon by the independents. Many persons who were charged from \$9 to \$14 a ton went to the office of President Baer, in the Jersey Central building, at the foot of Liberty street, to lodge complaints against the dealers who had charged the high prices. These persons were told by the clerks that President Baer had returned to Philadelphia and had left no instructions about receiving such complaints. They were advised to put the complaints in writing and forward them by mail to President Baer's office in Philadelphia.

"Curtis & Blaisdell and Burns Bros., two of the largest firms in the city, raised the price to their customers to \$9 a ton. Heretofore these firms have not charged more than \$7.50 a ton.

"Soft coal is expected to advance sharply as a result of the action of the independents. Yesterday the price was \$7.50 a ton, which is more than 100 per cent higher than the normal price.

"Should the plans of the independents to work the price up to almost prohibitive figures succeed, steps will probably be taken to have the health department again suspend the ordinance against soft coal, so as to reduce the demand for anthracite."

There are no "independent operators," although the New York World speaks of "independents." They, the so-called independents, are all in conspiracy with the coal-carrying railroads. It is impossible for the independents, so-called, to exist. They can mine as much coal as they please, but they cannot send it to market without permission of the railroads. On this point the Jersey City Evening Journal, a stalwart republican paper, remarks:

"The coal roads own nine-tenths of the anthracite mines, and there are no independent operators."

"The attempt on the part of the coal managers to show that there is competition is ridiculous.

"An independent mine owner can mine all the coal he wants to, but he cannot send it away from his mine without cars, and the cars are owned by his competitors. He cannot get a car or ship a pound without permission from the railroad companies, who own all the cars and railroads and nine-tenths of the mines.

"The railroad companies are corporations which hold their powers, not merely in trust for the pecuniary profit of the stockholders, but also in trust for the public weal. When a corporation acts prejudicially to the public, in order to make undue gains and profits for its stockholders, it uses its powers in a manner not contemplated by the law which confers them.

"These are the words of the late Chancellor McGill in deciding against the coal combine when it first began operations. They have just as much force now as ever they had.

"The coal combine has been created in a somewhat different form, but there is no doubt that it could be checked by this state if prompt action were taken."

Some days ago the New York American declared that the "independents," so-called, were in collusion with the railroads and the evidence presented was so strong, that all the newspapers, both democratic and republican, were obliged to admit the fact, and therefore what the Jersey City Evening Journal says about the "combine" is what all the papers in New York are saying.

There is a flood of bills, a flood of resolutions, a flood of talk at Washington. It is not worth while to repeat what they are saying in Washington, because a large part of it is either for partisan purposes or individual advantage. At any rate little of it is for the public good. For instance, Senator Vest's bill or resolution to put coal on the free list can't do any good. The duty on foreign coal is only 67 cents per ton. This does not account for the high price of our domestic coal—and if we should take the duty off of foreign coal, the price would not fall one cent on our domestic coal—certainly not more than 67 cents. It is, therefore, unfortunate that statesmen should be thinking or talking

about free trade, at a time when action is so much desired. What Mr. Vest ought to be doing is he should be drawing up articles of impeachment against the attorney general for not commencing a suit against the coal trust. The attorney general cannot furnish any excuse for not proceeding against this trust, because William R. Hearst has furnished the evidence, and it is in the hands of the attorney general. I inclose the open letter of Mr. Hearst to the president on this subject—and, indeed, on the whole subject. This letter shows either that the president or the attorney general should be impeached. I believe the president is honest, sincere and wants to do the right thing but some how or other he seems to be handicapped by his attorney general. The president is not a lawyer and he does not know how lawyers can contrive not to do things.

It is now up to the president to remove his attorney general. He can do this at once and he ought to do it at once. If he does not do it then congress ought to do it by impeachment.

We cannot, however, expect that congress will remove the attorney general by impeachment, first, because the senate has not adopted Senator Jones' resolution calling upon the attorney general to send the evidence, which Mr. Hearst has furnished, to the senate, so that all the world can see it. This resolution is so important that I reproduce it as follows:

"Resolution introduced in senate by Senator James K. Jones:

"Whereas, On October 4, 1902, a sworn statement or petition was filed with the attorney general of the United States by William Randolph Hearst, charging the existence of an illegal combination or conspiracy among railroads therein named engaged in interstate commerce, the tendency of which was the establishment of a monopoly in the business of transporting and selling anthracite coal, and in connection with said petition a request was made for permission to present evidence establishing the existence of such a combination;

"Whereas, Said petition was referred to the United States district attorney for the southern district of New York, with instructions to receive the evidence proffered and report the same to the department of justice;

"Whereas, A protracted interval has elapsed since the filing of said petition, and the submission of such evidence;

"Resolved, That the attorney general be and he is hereby directed to transmit to the senate the evidence presented by said petitioner, together with a report thereon by said United States district attorney."

I think Senator Jones' resolution is worthy of a second publication because it has been suppressed by all the New York papers (except the American). This is very unfair to the readers of the newspapers of New York. It shows that we cannot rely upon the papers for the news. The resolution was debated in the senate several days, and yet no note of the debate has been made by New York papers, except the American. The resolution is still pending, a fact that we would not know if it were not for the New York American.

JNO. S. DE HART.

Jersey City, N. J.

CANNOT BE DODGED

Mr. Van Vorhis Advises an Indiana Editor That the Money Question Cannot be Evaded

Readers of The Independent will doubtless remember Carl Brayfield, formerly editor of the Hoosier Democrat and a staunch supporter of the Chicago and Kansas City platforms. Some time last year the plutocratic element in the democratic party told him to "get off the earth" and he was obliged to sell his paper—or be ruined. He sold the paper. The new management seems to have scarcely enough ability to edit a sale bill, and the Hoosier Democrat from being one of the leading democratic journals of Indiana is now simply a conglomeration of "pay" locals and items to the effect that "John Smith has a new buggy—look out girls!"

Carl Brayfield has recently begun the publication of the Clark County Citizen, but lacks his old-time vigor. Apparently he is trying to put the money question in the background and make the "trusts and tariff" the slogan for 1904. The following letter to him from our esteemed contributor, Hon. Flavius Van Vorhis, will throw some light upon the question:

Editor Clark County Citizen: I have your issue of January 2, 1903, which you sent me, and for which I am much obliged. I have read your

"A New Year for Democracy."

You advise the party to swear off making a fool of itself; to stick to some well-defined democratic principles; to begin organization, and show that it is in earnest in a fight against trusts and tariff.

The trouble is that the party has been too slow in learning that a large number of men, whom it has been accustomed to regard as leaders, has been using its organization to advance their personal interests. These men have had little regard for principles, and have cared nothing about success, except such as put money into their own pockets.

I am at a loss to understand why, when you say they wanted the party to surrender convictions, you did not say plainly just what these convictions which they desired surrendered were. It seems to me that, in such an appeal as you make, it would have been opportune for you to have said plainly what you think are the "well-defined democratic principles" to which you think the party ought to stick. If you meant to state this when you advise a show of earnestness in a fight against "trusts and tariff," then to me the most interesting thing about your editorial is what you do not say. "McKinley democrats" is a very good name for the men who remained with the democratic party in name and voted the republican ticket, or who supported the republican platform but voted the democratic ticket to keep themselves regular that they might do the party the most harm in the future.

What were the declarations in the Chicago and Kansas City platforms to which these so-called democrats objected, and that expressed the convictions they desired (not "petty politicians in county and city precincts" but) the rank and file of the party to surrender? It was not the question of "trusts or tariffs." These are the fellows who desire now, and are "moving heaven and earth," to make the issues in the next national campaign a sham battle against "trusts and tariff." This is the class of men, who at Kansas City induced the friends of the Chicago platform and of Mr. Bryan, to make a most disastrous and foolish mistake when they allowed to be inserted in the platform of 1900 the declaration that imperialism was the paramount question. If they had stated in this connection that wealth, when concentrated in the hands of a few, produced imperialism, and that in the whole history of the world it never had any other origin, it might have done; but they did not.

What they wanted, and what they accomplished by this declaration, was to create the impression among the masses that the convention had declared the money question to be of secondary importance. It was inserted in the platform by men who did not want Mr. Bryan nominated, and who did not want him elected when he was nominated. It was put there by such men as went from Indiana as delegates, and who came home after the convention and had control of the democratic organization and used it, not in an effort for success, but to secure defeat.

These were not "inexperienced boys and dunderheads," but veterans in trickery and deceptions. Why did the New York crowd, and the friends of Cleveland in Indiana, want Mr. Bryan defeated? Because the purposes of the republican party or the financial question suited their interests better than the declarations of the democratic platform and the well-known convictions of Mr. Bryan. Everything that their ingenuity can devise is now being done to overshadow this question again.

The republican party is to "stand pat" on the tariff, and the Boston free trade league is flooding the country with literature to arouse an interest in this old humbug, so that attention may be kept away from the schemes of robbery that are covered up in the financial question. We hear from the mouths and read from the pen of this Cleveland-Hill-Olney-Hearst-National Bank crowd the slogan "Tariff is the mother of trusts."

I grant the republican party has made it impossible for a tariff to be applied wisely or honestly for any purpose except for revenue. It is too plain for controversy that any attempt to apply it for any other purpose is equivalent to, and in effect is, public robbery; but to assert directly or inferentially that trusts can be destroyed by a revision of the tariff schedule according to the doctrine of "tariff for revenue only" is too absurd for serious consideration.

The secretary of the Boston free trade league came to Indianapolis and gave a banquet at the Grand hotel at which it was specially arranged that no one was to mention the name of Mr. Bryan. To insure this silence, no one was invited, no difference how

sound on the tariff question, if it was believed that there was the slightest danger that he would refer to the Chicago or Kansas City platforms or to Mr. Bryan. Why this desire for silence? Why this anxiety to create the impression that the platforms and Mr. Bryan had ceased to interest the people? Why did the Indianapolis Sentinel report this banquet with such glowing enthusiasm, and make prominent the fact that Mr. Bryan was not mentioned? Everybody knows that as between Bryan and Cleveland the Sentinel is for Cleveland; that as between what Bryan represents and what Cleveland represents the Sentinel is still with Cleveland. What is the difference between these two men? What was it that caused Cleveland to desert the party standard in 1896? It was the declarations of the Chicago platform on the financial question, and the convictions of Mr. Bryan upon that question.

This question has come to stay. Make no mistake about that. The men who in 1896, inside and outside of the party, supported Mr. Bryan on the declarations of the Chicago platform, and did it from convictions on the money question, know too much to be humbugged by the attempt to smother this question by trusts and tariff. They know full well the evils of both, but they know that there is no hope of relief from the domination of trust combinations until the money question is settled according to correct economic principles, and the financial trusts are deprived of the power they have acquired over the money and credits of this nation and of its people. Make no mistake about Mr. Bryan either. No doubt there are many men as good and able as he is—and he may never be a candidate again—but no man living has so strong a hold upon the minds and hearts of the American people.

FLAVIUS J. VAN VORHIS.

Indianapolis, Ind.

United We Stand

Editor Independent: I helped to organize the populist party in Indiana, and believe it has always advocated the living issues for the people and country, and has done more for the country than any party during its history. Its success has only been thwarted by the division its enemies have been able to keep in its ranks. If reformers were united they would stand. But if divided they must fail. I admire the fight The Independent is making. I am a populist or Bryan democrat. JOHN C. ENGLE.

Francesville, Ind.

Nathan Demoulin, R. F. D. 4, Highland, Ill.: A week ago I wrote you to erase my name from your subscription list. After reading the last Independent I received (December 11), I think it my duty to sustain such a good reform paper. It is the right kind for all those who have a desire for better government. Herein find a dollar bill. If you have some copies left of the December 11 issue I wish you would send me a few to distribute.

All Sick Ones Get My Help When They Ask It.

It is waiting for you. Just write a postal stating which book you need and I will gladly do this:—

I will mail you an order—good at any drug store—for six bottles Dr. Shoop's Restorative. You may take it a month on trial. If it succeeds, the cost is \$5.50. If it fails, I will pay the druggist myself—and your mere word shall decide it.

I know how other treatments have failed with you. I know how the sick get discouraged. So I don't argue my claims. I simply ask you to try my way at my risk, and let the remedy itself convince you.

My records show that 39 out of each 40 pay for the treatment gladly, because they are cured. Not a penny is wanted from the rest.

I have spent a lifetime in learning how to strengthen weak inside nerves. My Restorative brings back that power which alone operates the vital organs. I treat a weak organ as I would a weak engine, by giving it the power to act. My way always succeeds, save when a cause like cancer makes a cure impossible. And most of these chronic diseases cannot be cured without it.

You'll know this when you read my book.

Simply state which book you want, and address Dr. Shoop, Box 940 Racine, Wis.

BOOK NO. 1 ON DYSPEPSIA
BOOK NO. 2 ON THE HEART
BOOK NO. 3 ON THE KIDNEYS
BOOK NO. 4 FOR WOMEN
BOOK NO. 5 FOR MEN (read)
BOOK NO. 6 ON RHEUMATISM

Mild cases, not chronic, are often cured by one or two bottles. At all druggists.