

In a speech Senator Platt of Connecticut declared: "We affirm that the tariff is the parent of prosperity." If the senator means prosperity that is confined to a limited circle of men who refer to themselves as "trustees of God" in the monopolization of property, then few will be inclined to take issue with him.

Monopoly on Prosperity.

Professor Zeublin in an address at the Minneapolis convention of employers and employes, referred to "the impudent and blasphemous and inefficient representative of the anthracite trust who proclaims himself the chosen of God." Professor Zeublin's reference was complete and needed no diagram in order to meet with full appreciation at the hands of his audience.

Baer the Trustee.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat says: "Neither the republican party nor President McKinley ever favored reciprocity on articles produced by American industries." Why then all this talk about reciprocity? What about Mr. McKinley's Buffalo speech? Reciprocity is self-descriptive, but according to the Globe-Democrat the republican reciprocity pledge is a delusion and a snare.

A Delusion and a Snare.

Eugene Foss of Massachusetts made a fight for the republican nomination for congress in the Eleventh district, took a bold stand in favor of radical tariff revision and insisted that the trusts should be deprived of tariff protection. He declared for free iron, free coal, and free hides. His opponent was a high protectionist and a bitter fight ensued in the primaries, but Foss was nominated.

Even in Massachusetts.

The Washington Post has discovered that after all "the republican organization is far from strength and harmony." It required considerable time for the Post to discover anything to the detriment of the republican organization, although the Post's proud boast is that it is a thoroughly independent newspaper. The Post might have discovered from the proceedings of the republican congress that "the republican organization was far from strength and harmony."

A Belated "Independent."

Some republican papers are indorsing the president's proposal for a tariff commission to which is to be assigned the duty of arranging the tariff "in accordance with present day necessities." Congress is presumed to be a tariff commission. Why not have congress act? It is difficult to escape the suspicion that the suggestion for a tariff commission is advanced for the purpose of securing the delay for which the tariff sheltered trusts are so anxious.

Congress Might Act.

The Keokuk Gate City, a republican paper, says: "It was the republican tariff law now on the books that wiped out the misery and discouragement entailed by the Wilson bill that was enacted by a democratic congress and signed by a democratic president. History so recent as this should not be forgotten at the polls this fall." The panic of 1893 occurred under the McKinley bill, a republican tariff measure. The Wilson bill did not go into effect until August, 1894. "History so recent as this should not be forgotten."

But Don't Forget History.

The Des Moines Register and Leader, a republican paper that generally seems to be fair, says of Mr. Bryan that "in 1892 he voted for General Weaver, the populist, for president rather than give his support to Mr. Cleveland." The Chicago Chronicle is responsible for this misleading statement and though the editor of the Chronicle has repeatedly been informed of his error he has reiterated the charge. The truth is that in 1892 the democratic national committee urged democrats in Kansas, Nebraska, and other western states to vote for General Weaver, in order to insure democratic victory, the committee being under the impression that the contest would be considerably closer than it was. In Nebraska James E. Boyd, then the democratic governor, sent letters to democrats throughout the state asking them to vote the Weaver electoral ticket and stating that

The Chicago Chronicle Yarn.

he was authorized to make this request by the democratic national committee. The democrats who voted for General Weaver in 1892 did not do so for the purpose of defeating the democratic national ticket. They did so at the suggestion of the democratic national committee and for the purpose of aiding in the election of the democratic national ticket. These are the facts well known to the Chicago Chronicle, but that newspaper has never had the honesty to make the correction. Those who are acquainted with the character of the Register and Leader will expect better conduct on the part of the Des Moines paper.

The St. Louis Republic insists that the bribe-givers representing the immense corporations of St. Louis that corrupted the public service be punished. According to the Republic, the bribe-givers are "more guilty than the bribe-takers. It cannot be doubted that Circuit Attorney Folk will exert every effort to bring the bribe-givers to justice and it is to be hoped he will succeed, although it must be confessed that the difficulties involved in the situation do not encourage the hope that the wealthy rascals will be made to suffer for their crimes.

Bribe Givers and Bribe Takers.

Judge Wade, the democratic nominee for congress in the Second Iowa district, advises the democrats to "return to the teachings of Grover Cleveland." The democrats of the United States have a lively recollection of the disastrous results of Grover Cleveland's second administration. These things are so fresh in the democratic mind that one must be impressed with the courage, to call it by a polite name, of the man who would advise the democrats to return to the teachings of one who, while one of the greatest beneficiaries of the democratic party, proved to be one of its worst enemies.

Mighty Poor Advice.

In one of his speeches Mr. Roosevelt referred to the United States in the plural. A Boston paper took offense at this eminently correct reference and the Pittsburg Dispatch says: "It does not appear that the president did this intentionally, but if he did he might justify it on two grounds. First, that the way the constitution uses the term is good enough for him; second, that the United States are plenty big enough to rival the sovereigns of Europe by describing themselves in the plural number." It will also probably appear on investigation that every lawyer who has occupied the presidential chair has referred to the United States in the plural.

In the Plural.

Abram S. Hewitt, a man who, while having been honored by a number of offices at the hands of the democratic party, refused to support the democratic national ticket in 1896 and in 1900, has rushed into print on several occasions for the purpose of denouncing the coal strikers and defending the coal barons. The Lincoln Journal, a republican paper, commenting upon Mr. Hewitt's defense of Baer and his associates, says that Mr. Hewitt is "the most level-headed democrat in this country." In the view of republican organs the "level-headed democrat" is the one who votes the republican ticket and cultivates republican habits. In this view, then, Mr. Hewitt is deserving of all the compliments he is now receiving from the republican press.

"A Level Headed Democrat."

J. K. Murrell, the man whose confession resulted in the expose of the St. Louis boodlers, says: "I have been honest heretofore in all matters, and have done no man wrong, and thought I would not take a dollar from any person unlawfully, but the practice of the combine in the assembly in taking bribes was so frequent that I went along with the tide and did not realize the enormity of my offense and my conscience was seared in that regard. No matter what happens to me, I will do all I can to aid the circuit attorney in breaking up the boodle gang that has so long controlled affairs in this city and to atone as far as I can for my awful mistake. I feel better and happier and my mind is easier now than for months." An honest confession is good for the soul; and accepting this statement in the spirit in which it seems to have been given, it may be said that Murrell has done society so valuable a service that he will be justified in feeling that he has in part atoned for his great wrong.

Murrell's Partial Atonement

That Constitutional Amendmen.

(Continued from Page 3.)

cise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States.

Sec. 3. Congress shall have power to enforce the provisions of this article by appropriate legislation.

It will be seen by the language of this resolution that congress, by the mere passage of a law, could have assumed exclusive power over trusts and monopolies and that states could not have exercised any power in that respect which in any manner conflicted with the laws passed by congress.

The bill was also intended to strike a blow at labor organizations, and Mr. McCall, a republican member from Massachusetts, on this account voted against the resolution. In explanation of his vote Mr. McCall said:

"I intend to vote against the proposed amendment to the constitution which at most will keep the word of promise to the ear, but break it to the hope. . . . Let us not deceive ourselves about this proposition. This amendment is not simply aimed at trusts and monopolies, but it has application to every form of individual combination, and in my judgment it confers upon congress a power to strike a most deadly blow at individual liberty. . . . It involves the control of the labor organizations of the country, and of any co-partnership or union of two or more men for any business purpose whatsoever. . . . And what will be the effect if we concentrate upon one body of men the control of more than one-third of the capital of the world, and all these other tremendous influences? Is there a gentleman on this floor who does not believe in his heart that if this power is conferred on congress, the most corrupt and rottenest place in the universe will be found right here in the city of Washington?"

Although at the time this measure came up for a vote there were 357 members of the house, the measure received only 154 votes because its purpose was so plain that many republicans could not be persuaded to vote for it.

Lots of Five.

The Commoner's "Lots of Five" proposition is so familiar that it needs but little explanation. The plan was adopted for the purpose of furthering the interests of democracy by increasing the circulation and influence of The Commoner. The mission of this periodical is to discuss from a democratic standpoint all the questions of public concern and to assist insofar as possible in keeping the democratic party true to its principles and its traditions.

The "Lots of Five" plan has been successful to a gratifying degree. Upwards of 5,000 of The Commoner's subscribers have ordered subscription cards, and the increased circulation thereby secured has greatly widened The Commoner's sphere of influence. Subscription cards in "Lots of Five" are sold at the price of \$3 per lot—which is at the rate of 60 cents a year for a single subscription. The purchaser of a "Lot of Five" will find it an easy matter to dispose of the cards at the price paid. If you will undertake the work of selling one or more more of these "lots" you will be undertaking a work calculated to exert an influence for good in the cause of democratic supremacy. You take no financial risk in ordering these cards because you may order them and remit to this office after you have sold them. If you will assume the responsibility of selling one or more "Lots of Five" fill out the coupon printed below and mail to this office.

APPLICATION FOR
"Lots of Five Subscription Cards."

PUBLISHER COMMONER: Please send me five subscription cards. I promise to use my utmost endeavor to sell these cards, and will remit for them at the rate of 60 cents each when sold.

Name

Postoffice

County

State