

THE FORUM OF THE WEEKLY PRESS

THE PRESIDENT AND THE TRUSTS

THE BLIGHT OF CLEVELANDISM

Scribner (Neb.) News: How does President Roosevelt know that the Sherman anti-trust law is not sufficiently stringent when his attorney general has never tried to enforce it?

Easton (Md.) Star Democrat: The success of Mr. Roosevelt's efforts to secure tariff concessions in behalf of Cuba may be regarded as typical of the support he will receive from a republican congress in any effort he may make to curtail the power of the trusts.

Franklin (Pa.) Spectator: President Roosevelt never once asked congress to do a thing against the trusts. He waited until he came to Pittsburg to deliver that dramatic pronouncement, knowing it to be a harmless thunderbolt as long as the republicans have control.

Centerville (Miss.) Jeffersonian: President Roosevelt has decided to make war on the trusts. Mr. President, the people know that congress has adjourned and they also know that when you say that you are going to make war on the trusts that you are just giving us some "hot air."

Lewiston (Ill.) News: The trusts own the republican party body and soul and they are glad to have a war lord to pose and howl before the people; especially as he capitulates to them in private on every vile scheme of plunder which greed can invent.

Montrose (Pa.) Democrat: The president's anti-trust laws are being laughed at, and are regarded as a belated attempt to save his party's reputation. Chairman Griggs, of the democratic congressional committee, criticizes Roosevelt for waiting till congress adjourned before taking action.

Crisfield (Md.) News: President Roosevelt is giving wide publicity to his intention of "dealing with the trusts," but the record of the Fifty-seventh congress proves Mr. Roosevelt's inability to do anything in this direction, even if he be sincere in his desire to accomplish trust restriction.

Bellefonte (Pa.) Democratic Watchman: It's a fine time for the president to grow so blatant against trusts, and so concerned about the welfare of Cuba. The time to act was while congress was in session. Had he done something then there would be little need of so much insincere solicitation now.

Fergus Falls (Minn.) Weekly: President Roosevelt waxed eloquent in opposition to encroachment of the trusts, in his Pittsburg speech—then went to dinner and spent the rest of the day with Mr. Frick, president of the biggest trust in the country. They agreed that trust encroachments are things to kick about in public.

Schulenburg (Tex.) Sticker: Now that congress has adjourned the president is touring the country, delivering speeches in which his unalterable determination is proclaimed of having

such legislation enacted as is essential to the absolute regulation of the trusts, and a great many people will accept his declared intention as sincere!

Monmouth (Ill.) Democrat: We will restrain the trusts, said Mr. Roosevelt, and the attorney general forthwith proceeded to do the restraining act. The trusts in the meantime have given the president and the attorney general the "ha-ha," and a republican congress has passed into history with no attempt to make the Sherman anti-trust law effective.

Chilton (Wis.) Times: The republican party has been in absolute control of the executive office and both branches of congress since March 4, 1897. It has promised the people relief from the trusts, but thus far has taken no steps to carry out the promises. Will the people not see that all this talk of republicans getting after the trusts is buncombe?

Tiffin (O.) Advertiser: Not one law was passed by the republican congress to prevent or restrain the trusts from robbing the people, although republican platforms pretended to be against trusts. If you judge it by its fruits, you must condemn it for its hypocrisy and false pretense, and its endeavor to fool the people, while permitting the rapacity of the trusts to continue.

Rolla (Mo.) Sharpshooter: A Cleveland democrat is a very good Roosevelt republican.

Pittsburg (Kas.) Kansas: Oh, yes—the Cleveland-Hill democrats—but, by the way, there are none—these fellows are all republicans.

Mesquite (Tex.) Mesquiter: In giving advice to the democratic party, Grover Cleveland places himself in an attitude similar to the confidential clerk who stole all his employer's money and then wrote him a letter telling him how to get another start.

Mayfield (Ky.) Mirror: Grover Cleveland might better have remained in his hole. His recent "harmony" speech has embittered every democrat who did not formerly agree with his monetary views and has made enemies of many consistent democrats who do not love a wrecker.

Alvarado (Tex.) Bulletin: For eighteen years the Baltimore Sun has been one of the blindest Cleveland partisans in the country, not excepting some of the Texas sycophants and notwithstanding the fact that he has twice wrecked the party it still wants more of Clevelandism and more debauchery by the New York politicians.

Bulesville (Ark.) Bee: The reorganizers and whilom bolters of the democratic national ticket and platforms take great pride in pointing to Cleveland's two elections as proof of

out an act of congress, without the knowledge of the "business interests" and not a word of protest was heard.

Hastings (Mich.) Journal: Who defeated Bryan and the democratic party in 1896, and made imperialism and high protective tariff possible? Cleveland, Hill, Whitney, Dickinson, Belmont, Pattison and a long line of reorganizers, who now want the democrats who stood loyal to their party to acknowledge they were in error and bow down before these gilded presumptuous deserters and obey their mandates. Democracy can afford to wait for victory of principles, rather than secure power and place by a policy the republican party and their allies indorse.

Munfordville (Ky.) News: The common people in 1896 knew that they were suffering and they knew that they were suffering from the evil effects of the gold standard; and they knew that they had put Cleveland in office to give them some relief from the evil and they knew that he had not only failed to give them relief, but that he had made matters worse. So in their little county conventions all over America they met and made a whip out of the strong cords of disgust, discontent, disappointment and disapproval and drove out the money changers and cleaned the temple of democracy.

Rochester (Ind.) Democrat: The republican papers are saying, with the bolting democrats, that Bryan wrecked the democratic party just as Cleveland had given it power and prominence. Oh, fudge! Who wrecked the democratic party in 1894—two years before Colonel Bryan was thought of as a party leader? Indiana gave Cleveland 11,000 majority in 1892, and two years later rebuked his administration by 47,000 republican majority. And two years later Bryan reduced the republican majority of 1894 nearly 30,000. This talk of Bryan wrecking the popularity of democratic principles which Cleveland had established is tiresome and positively silly. But the republican papers find it a convenient paddle with which to pat Grover and swat Bryan.

El Reno (O. T.) Globe: There is a crowd of so-called reorganizers of the democratic party who are working in the interest of trusts and the money power. Why are they coming in evidence. The leaders know that there is to be a political change and that if Cleveland, Hill or any one of these reorganizers will only be democratic in name and when elected the present policy would continue. We must be on our guard and see that whoever seeks to be our standard-bearer has given full and undivided support to the democratic nominee in 1896 and 1900. Nominate a democratic democrat, not a pretender or a traitor to the party, who now wishes to be a leader when the prospects for democratic success are growing brighter every day.

An Honest Confession.

We paid \$20,000,000 for the Philippines, and have spent for the army \$170,000,000 on them since. We wish to the Lord it had been the democrats that did it.—Gallipolis (O.) Tribune (Republican).

Iola (Kas.) Farmers' Friend: Everybody knows about the Yankee farmer who locked the stable after his last horse was stolen. Well, President Roosevelt's plan to crush the trusts is a parallel. He announces, now that congress has adjourned, that he intends to wage war on the trusts "vigorously" and urges congress "to act" on a bill to be prepared by Mr. Littlefield of Maine; and that the attorney general is to be conferred with and then the measure is to be made an administration measure.

Richmond (Mo.) Conservative: Now that congress has adjourned, President Roosevelt announces that he intends to wage a vigorous war on the trusts at the next session. There never was a more opportune time for the enactment of legislation for the control and supervision of trusts than during the session which closed last week, and the republican party alone is responsible for the failure of that body to enact legislation along this line. The recent declaration of war by the president will not worry the trusts; neither will the people consider it seriously.

the superiority of his brand of politics, but in this connection they never recall the congressional elections of 1894 in which their fetich, Grover, led the party through the slaughter house into the open grave of the most disastrous defeat in twenty years.

Wiser (Idaho) Signal: God save the democratic party from any "restoration" to Clevelandism. It would be better to support the republican party outright, because then you would know what you were voting for and would get the goods with the correct label on, instead of having the same thing handed you under the guise of democracy.

Red Lodge (Mont.) Chronicle: Cleveland vetoed the bill to coin the seigniorage with a great flourish of trumpets, and his claquers among the so-called "business interests" made the air resound with their shouts of approval. He had "saved the credit of the nation" and protected our currency from the baneful effects of another influx of "rotten money." McKinley went to work quietly and coined this self-same seigniorage with-