

for twenty years been the earnest, consistent and unswerving advocate of low tariff." If the editor of the Telegram will examine the record he will have to admit that Mr. Cleveland has neither been earnest nor consistent nor unswerving in his advocacy of a low tariff. On the contrary, he has by his conduct shown very little interest in the subject of tariff reform, and even his speeches (which have been more consistent than his acts) do not disclose any broad understanding of the principles which control the question.

As to the second proposition, that a low tariff is "the present live issue" and that it is "the only rational means yet discovered to properly curb the trusts," The Commoner has already spoken. Imperialism is a live issue; the money question must be alive or the republicans would not be attempting to secure an asset currency, branch banks and a redeemable silver dollar, and the trust question, while related to a high tariff, is even broader than the tariff and cannot be settled by putting trust-made articles on the free list. An industry that can live without a tariff can be controlled by a trust without the aid of the tariff. A high tariff enables the trust to charge extortionate prices, but a trust that can export in competition with the world can exist under absolute free trade. While The Commoner advocates and urges the putting of trust-made articles on the free list, it goes farther and insists upon legislation which will make a private monopoly impossible. Mr. Cleveland, while thundering against the trusts, has never suggested a remedy. Neither do those suggest a remedy who are willing to abandon all other questions to concentrate the fight on the tariff question.

Although the party has been defeated on the tariff question oftener than on any other issue, The Commoner still believes that a protective tariff is wrong in principle, unwise in policy and unnecessary in practice. But The Commoner is not willing to abandon the people's interests on other questions merely to give standing in the party to those who advocate nothing else that is democratic and never advocate tariff reform when it interferes with the plans of the money changers. Much less is it willing to encourage those who proclaim great animosity toward industrial trusts and at the same time secretly plot to fasten upon the people a money trust and a banking trust. The democratic party must meet every issue as it arises, and it must defend the people's rights from encroachments from every quarter.

And This is Harmony.

The New York World is a leader among the reorganizing element. In a recent editorial, the World asserts that Mr. Cleveland did not leave the democratic party in 1896, but that the party left Mr. Cleveland. The World says that Mr. Cleveland simply stood still on precisely the platform on which the democratic party twice elected him president. According to the World, it was the Chicago convention that left the democratic party, and the World says:

The democrats who are still at "the old stand" occupy the only right and hopeful rallying-point for a reunion of the scattered forces, to be effected without recantation on one side or reproaches on the other, for a new departure on old lines.

This is a fine description of the brand of "harmony" favored by the reorganizers.

"The only right and hopeful rallying-point for a reunion of the scattered forces" is the point occupied by those who deserted the democratic party in 1896 and in 1900.

The only way by which harmony may be obtained is to permit these reorganizers to write the platform and to make it so nearly like the republican platform that the chief difference between the democratic party and the republican party will be in name.

It is gratifying to be told by this eminent

reorganizer that if the millions of democrats who were faithful in 1896 and in 1900 will go to "the only right and hopeful rallying-point for a reunion"—which, in other words, is the point occupied by the deserters—the millions of faithful democrats may privately entertain whatever opinions they choose and will be spared the humiliation of being reproached for giving public expression to their honest opinions in the campaigns of 1896 and 1900.

Promise and Performance.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, republican, says:

The republican is the only party which has the honesty, the courage and the brains to deal with the trusts effectively, as the record since 1887, when the trusts first began to appear, proves. On the trust issue there is a magnificent victory in store for the republican party in the elections of 1902.

The Globe-Democrat also says: "In the speech which he made a few days before President McKinley's assassination, Vice President Roosevelt outlined a course in regard to the trusts which he has followed as president. In his message to congress last December he made his position on this question so clear that nobody in the country has been under the slightest doubt in that particular since."

Let us examine this republican brief.

In the speech referred to, Mr. Roosevelt said that it would be necessary in the future to "shackle cunning as in the past we have shackled force." He referred then to the trust magnates as representatives of cunning. What has been his attitude since he became president? In the message to which the Globe-Democrat refers, instead of alluding to the trust magnates as representatives of cunning, Mr. Roosevelt referred to them as "captains of industry."

How has he proceeded to shackle cunning since he became president? He has instituted civil proceedings against the proposed railroad merger and against the beef combine. He has failed, however, to bring criminal proceedings against the men whom in his civil bill he charged with being guilty of conspiracy in restraint of trade.

Although he has at his command an army of capable lawyers and although trusts are multiplying all over the country, he has raised his arm only against two organizations and that in a very feeble way.

With what reason does this republican paper say the republican party is "the only party which has the honesty and the courage and the brains to deal with the trusts effectively as the record since 1887, when the trusts first began to appear, proves?" The record shows that since 1897, when the republican regime went into power, more trusts have been organized than existed in all the previous history of the country.

For more than six years the republican party has been in control of the presidency, the senate, and the house of representatives. The republican congress adjourned without making even an effort toward giving the people relief on the trust question. That congress was asked to provide for the removal of the tariff on trust-made products, but it refused. It was urged to make some amendments to the anti-trust law in order to make that law more effective, but it failed in this duty.

And after congress had fully ignored this question, the echo of the speaker's gavel had hardly died away before it was announced through the columns of the republican press that Mr. Roosevelt had invited Congressman Littlefield to prepare a bill to be considered at the next session of congress, the purpose of which would be to provide an effective weapon to be used against the trusts.

If the republican party is honest and courage-

ous on this question, why has the republican congress failed to act?

It is now denied that Mr. Littlefield has been chosen for this work, but why all this talk about amendments to the law in the presence of the fact that the administration has not exhausted all the weapons provided by the law already on the statute books?

The reference to Mr. Littlefield revives an interesting bit of history. Mr. Littlefield figured conspicuously in a former chapter relating to the trust question. It will be remembered that two years ago Mr. Littlefield advocated a constitutional amendment which was designed to confer on congress the power to regulate and control all trusts and corporations. This proposed amendment was prepared with the knowledge that it would be defeated and it was prepared exclusively for campaign purposes. The democrats voted against it on the ground that it would, if adopted, remove all power and authority over trusts from the states and place that power solely and exclusively with the federal government; and in the ensuing campaign republicans pointed to the introduction of this amendment by the republicans and the defeat of it by the democrats as testimony showing that the republican party was really the foe of trusts, while the democrats were not sincere on that question. They claimed then that the solution of the question was to place the power in the federal government.

What does Mr. Roosevelt say on this point now? In his speech delivered July 4 at Pittsburg, Mr. Roosevelt said: "Special legislation is needed. Some of that legislation must come through municipalities, some through states, some through the national government." So, after all, the Littlefield amendment of two years ago was wrong and democrats who opposed that amendment were right in spite of the claims made by the republican campaign orators.

Can the intelligent man expect relief on the trust question from a political party that has played fast and loose with the people on this question as the republican party has done? Can he expect that a party which derives its campaign funds from the trusts may be depended upon either in the executive department or the legislative department to give the people relief from the impositions they are suffering today at the hands of the trust magnates?

Trusts Begin to Threaten.

While Mr. Littlefield denies that he has been asked to prepare an anti-trust bill for the president, the press notice to the effect that he was working on such a bill scared the trust managers and as a result protests are already arriving. Mr. Wellman, in the Chicago Record-Herald, says that "hundreds of letters and telegrams are pouring in on the president at Oyster Bay urging him to go slow on this trust business. Capitalists, bankers, and heads of big insurance companies and managers of great railroad and other corporations are trying to intimidate the president into abandoning his program. Their idea is that he will hurt business, and they do not hesitate to predict that if a panic were to come the president's war on trusts would be held responsible therefor!"

This sounds very familiar. These are the same people who opposed bimetalism and threatened a panic. That is their favorite threat.

Mr. Wellman says that the president is not scared, but it is evident that the chief executive is spending a good deal of time explaining that he is only after the "bad" trusts.

Mr. Wellman says that "in the president's opinion the worst evil of modern trusts is not monopoly or restraint of trade, but the era of wild speculation in capital stocks brought about by the efforts of promoters to gain great fortunes by printing millions of share certificates and