

leave it master of the field. If you took off the duty on woollens the wool trust would probably close every one of its mills.

Senator Lodge thought the methods of regulating trusts by putting them into the control of the public through the government is the silliest remedy ever suggested. He thought the first remedy is supervision and publicity, and the latter is the first thing to seek.

He admits that five per cent of the trusts are bad! Can it be that so many have failed to contribute to the republican campaign fund? What candid man can read Senator Lodge's speech and then believe that the republican party intends to employ any effective remedy or is competent to do so? A few years ago all trusts were bad, now nineteen out of twenty are good and harmless, and no earnest effort is being made to curb the other five per cent—this is the history of the republican party on this question.

If the republicans are indorsed by the people again they will be convinced that trusts are popular and must not be interfered with at all. Senator Lodge also suggests publicity, but neither he nor Senator Dolliver mentioned the enforcement of the criminal law against the trusts. Why this tenderness when dealing with those who impudently and arrogantly disregard the statutes of the United States? Neither of the senators favored putting trust-made articles on the free list. Why this solicitude for the men who conspire against the very people who generously built a tariff wall to protect the manufacturers from outside competition?

It is true, as Senator Lodge says, that the putting of trust-made articles on the free list would in some cases only reduce the profit and not necessarily destroy the trust, but is that sufficient objection to such a law? The argument made by the senator shows how short-sighted it is for the reorganizers to urge the free list as a complete remedy—it is a step in the right direction and will do much good, but it must be accompanied by something that strikes at the principle of monopoly. The Kansas City platform democrats favor publicity—the only remedy suggested by the republicans, and they favor putting trust-made articles on the free list—the only remedy advocated by the reorganizers, but they go further than either and insist that "a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable" even though it exists without a tariff and all its affairs are made public. The Kansas City platform presents the only complete remedy and it is a significant fact that the reorganizers, where they present a general indorsement of the last national platform, always neglect to indorse the anti-trust plank. The Kansas City platform remedy is to distinguish between the natural man and the corporation and to say that, while the natural man in one state must compete with the natural man in any other state, the corporate person created by law ought to be shut up in the state of its origin until it shows that it is going into interstate commerce for a lawful purpose and not to act as a highwayman around the industries. There is sufficient ground for this distinction. Natural men are much the same; they are subject to the same moral restraints and to practically the same criminal laws, and competition between them is, therefore, comparatively fair, but states differ widely in regard to the character of corporations organized, in regard to their regulation and the latitude given them. There is no reason why a natural person or even a corporation in a state which properly regulates corporations should be subjected to the competition of a corporation organized in a state like New Jersey, where corporations are given every license and immunity that unscrupulous greed can suggest. It is no interference with natural or individual rights to say by federal statute that a corporation organized in a state must be satisfied to do business in that state unless it can show that it contains no watered stock and is not trying to monopolize any branch of business. These facts—if they are facts—can be easily shown. They are entirely in the possession of the corporation and it is no hardship on the corporation to compel it to produce them. Every honest corporation desiring to do a legitimate business is interested in the suppression of every illegitimate corporation which is attempting to secure a monopoly.

This remedy does not interfere with the state's right to regulate its own affairs. It is not an interference with the state's rights to say that it shall not convert its territory into a "robbers' roost" and organize corporations to prey upon the rest of the country. A federal license to a corporation to go outside of the state of its origin would not and should not prevent a state exercising control over foreign corporations. A federal license to sell liquor does not interfere with the right of a state to license or prohibit the sale of liquor within its borders, so the federal license

suggested would not interfere with the right of any state to legislate as it pleases in regard to corporations organized or doing business within its borders. The remedy suggested supplements the work of the state without interfering with it in any way. Some object to increasing the powers of the federal government, but this remedy does not in any way strengthen the federal government. It does not contemplate or permit the creation of corporations by the federal government (as President Roosevelt's plan does), but is merely intended to carry out the constitutional provision authorizing congress to regulate interstate commerce. Congress is the only power that can regulate commerce between the states, and what more needful regulation can there be than the suppression of private monopolies? A private monopoly has always been considered an outlaw and congress alone can furnish a complete remedy. Congress can prevent the use of the mails by a lottery, why not prevent the use of the mails by a private monopoly? Why not prevent the use of the interstate telegraph lines and interstate railroads by a private monopoly? Why permit an industrial despotism to be foisted upon the country when it can be prevented by a brief statute? Senator Dolliver said he thought this remedy unconstitutional, but his opinion is not binding upon congress or upon the supreme court. Let it be tried and tested at once. There is no reason to believe that it would be declared unconstitutional, but in the event of such a decision it would then be time to suggest a constitutional amendment, not to allow congress to create corporations, but to allow congress to protect the people of forty-four states from the corporations organized in one state.

The republicans talk about trusts, but they have no effective remedy; the reorganizers talk about trusts, but they have no complete remedy. The Kansas City platform presents a complete remedy—the only one—and those who believe in that platform insist that the people shall consider that remedy. It is time to stop talking generalities and get down to business. The Kansas City platform means business and that is the reason the trusts spent their money lavishly to prevent the indorsement of that platform at the polls, and that is also one reason why the reorganizers are so much opposed to indorsing that platform.

Here is an anti-trust remedy that bills—will the president and his followers accept it? If not, they must suggest something better or confess that they are not in earnest.

A Sample of Exaggeration.

Below will be found an illustration of the exaggeration sometimes employed by those who assume to describe current events. Attention would not be called to it but for the fact that such items are often made the basis for editorial comment and the public is constantly being misled:

"Lincoln, Neb., Sept. 2.—W. J. Bryan came near losing his life after the Labor Day exercises yesterday as the result of playing the part of peacemaker. After the original combatants had been separated one of them made for Mr. Bryan with a revolver in one hand and a knife in the other.

"Bryan was equal to the occasion, however, and at once closed with his assailant, who was frenzied from liquor and the excitement of his previous conflict. Mr. Bryan is no weakling, but he was finding his antagonist anything but easy, and it looked as though he could hardly escape a slash from the knife, at least.

"At this juncture John Burke, a bystander, came to his assistance, and the two speedily threw the enraged man on the ground and disarmed him. Those present wanted Mr. Bryan's assailant turned over to the police. Mr. Bryan, however, advised letting him go, and the assailant departed without anyone as much as learning his name.

"Though a large number of people saw the affair no one present knew the man. After it was all over Mr. Bryan mounted his horse and rode away."

Now behold how much smoke can arise from a little fire! The facts are: Mr. Bryan was going along the road with three other gentlemen when just in front of the party several half-intoxicated men became involved in a quarrel and began striking at one another. Mr. Bryan joined those who were with him in separating the fighters, a thing easily accomplished, as the fighters did not seem to be very much excited. This was the end of the incident. No knives were drawn. One of the parties to the fight said something about shooting,

but he did not draw any revolver and it is very doubtful whether he had one.

Out of this very insignificant incident the above report was sent broadcast. The Labor Day picnic was a large and orderly one, and this, the only disturbance noted, was not noticed by any considerable number on the grounds.

Speaking of exaggerations, another recent instance might be cited. The press dispatches have been chronicling the purchase of "two \$2,500 mantels" for Mr. Bryan's residence at Fairview. The fact is that the most expensive mantel in the house cost less than \$200 and it was bought of an advertiser in *The Commoner* whose patronage considerably lessens the net outlay.

Idaho Democrats.

The Idaho democrats met in state convention at Pocatello, September 4, and reaffirmed the Kansas City platform. Although it was predicted by some that Idaho democrats would repudiate the national platform, these prophets are now wholly without honor.

The Commoner congratulates the democrats of Idaho on their fidelity to democratic principles. They have not been misled by the ingenious pleas of those who would republicanize the democratic party. They have shown themselves to be true to the faith and if there are democrats who at this moment fail to see the wisdom of the course adopted by the democracy of Idaho, the eyes of the doubting Thomases will yet be opened, and they will realize that honesty is the best policy in the affairs of political parties as well as in the affairs of individuals.

Interpreting a Platform.

That was an interesting conference held at Des Moines, Ia., on the evening of September 4. Senator Dolliver, Speaker Henderson, and other members of Iowa's congressional delegation met with the chairman of the republican state committee and Governor Cummins for the purpose of discussing the situation. Mr. Henderson said that the tariff and the trusts were the issues and that the party should stand on the state and national platforms, platforms which, by the way, are inconsistent with one another at least so far as the tariff is concerned.

Congressman Conner said that the Iowa platform "was for protection, but not to an unnecessary extent," and he thought the national and state platforms could be operated in harmony.

Congressman Thomas interpreted the state platform as a plain statement of the attitude of the republican party generally and Congressman Lacey said that in spite of the "no shelter for monopoly" provision in the Iowa state platform, there should be no radical change in the tariff.

Congressman Hedge admitted that he didn't know just what he would have to meet until the campaign opened, but he was prepared for almost anything.

Speaker Henderson said that while he would not have placed the "no shelter for monopoly" plank in the Iowa platform if he had had the framing of it, he could not see that the situation was at all serious. That plank did not mean, he declared, that the present tariff is a shelter for monopolies. He urged all the republicans to stand squarely on the platform, saying that he proposed to do so.

If the Iowa platform did not mean that the present tariff is a shelter for monopoly, why did a republican state convention deem it necessary to protest against shelter for monopolies in the tariff?

Mr. Henderson does not agree with the Chicago Tribune, that eminent republican newspaper, that says it is "a notorious fact" that the present tariff does provide shelter for monopoly; and Mr. Henderson does not agree with Governor Cummins, who says: "The truth is that those who are enjoying monopolies are every day laughing at the inertness of the people and wondering how long the reign of inactivity will continue."

If the Iowa platform does not mean that the present tariff is a shelter to monopoly, what, in the name of truth, does that platform mean and why was it adopted?

The Idaho republican convention adopted a platform in which it declared: "We favor a revision of the tariff without unreasonable delay which will place upon the free list every article and product controlled by a monopoly." We presume Mr. Henderson will say that the Idaho republicans did not mean that there are any articles and products now on the tariff list that are controlled by a monopoly.