

In the newspaper references to the late G. F. Swift, the packing house magnate, it is pointed out that Mr. Swift was once an humble butcher and this some newspapers claim is a proof of what may be accomplished by humble and industrious men in this country. But there are today thousands of capable butchers in this country and yet can any of them find under present conditions any reason to believe that they could make the progress made by the great Chicago packer?

The Butcher of Today.

Secretary of the Treasury Shaw, in a speech recently delivered, said: "The Sherman law contains quite drastic provisions applicable to both persons and corporations when one is proven to have combined or to have conspired to combine for the purpose of monopolizing a business or a trade privilege." Perhaps Mr. Shaw referred to the criminal clause which is the chief feature of the Sherman law; and yet he neglected to explain to his audience how it happened that the republican administration has not undertaken to enforce that law.

That Drastic Provision.

Mr. Thomas Vose, writing to the Chicago Chronicle, protests because that newspaper charged Mr. Bryan with the entire responsibility for the Chicago platform. Mr. Vose says that "it is a slur upon and an insult to all the delegates and the people who sent them to give almost the whole credit to Mr. Bryan for that platform." Mr. Vose is eminently correct, but he forgets that it suits the purposes of the Chicago Chronicle and papers of that character to make it appear that Mr. Bryan stands solitary and alone as the champion of the democratic platform.

Written by the People.

A democratic senator, referring to the nominee for president in 1904, is quoted by the New York Sun as saying: "I would not care whether he is a regular or a bolter. I think it is democratic doctrine as well as Christian doctrine that when a man repents, he shall be taken back on the same ground as if he had never sinned." But it must be remembered that the bolters who are now trying to reorganize the democratic party have not repented. On the contrary, they boast of their political sins. They are not willing to embrace democratic doctrine, but boldly announce that it is their purpose to alter that doctrine so that it shall conform to their ideas.

Have Not Repented.

The Chicago Record-Herald, a republican paper, referring to Senator Allison's public repudiation of reciprocity, says: "Does Senator Allison voice the real sentiments of the party leaders upon this question? Is there to be an abandonment of the contention that reciprocity is an essential complement of the protective tariff? If so, is not the time opportune for discarding the disingenuous flapdoodle upon this question that has been embodied in party platforms? If the party leaders do not believe in it why not be honest with the people and say so in the next republican national platform." The Record-Herald overlooks the fact, however, that if the republican leaders discarded all the "flapdoodle" in their platform, they might be confronted with the alternative of doing without a platform altogether or meeting in a serious way the important questions before the people.

Flapdoodle in Platforms.

Henry Loomis Nelson, whom we are informed "speaks for the eastern democracy which is antagonistic interference with trusts and which if it controls the democratic national convention of 1904 will name a candidate against Mr. Roosevelt, who will have the support of Mr. Morgan and his friends," has written an interesting review of Mr. Roosevelt's career. While Mr. Nelson is very complimentary to Mr. Roosevelt, he says that the president has "strongly appealed to the anti-trust sentiment of the country which is wide-spread and dangerous;" and he adds, "Mr. Roosevelt ought to be at the head of the economic and socialistic radicals of the country." Mr. Nelson explains that the only way to put Mr. Roosevelt in that position is for the democrats to nominate a man in whom the business interests of the east have confidence. He says that if this is not done that in spite of the "massing forces" behind Mr. Roosevelt, "the so-called money power will prefer

Must Please Morgan.

Roosevelt to any democrat in whom the conservative interests have not implicit confidence." Commenting upon Mr. Nelson's statement, the Des Moines Register and Leader, a republican paper, says: "President Roosevelt could ask no better political fortune to befall him than that the shaping of the next campaign could be left to Mr. Nelson and the men he speaks for."

Mr. Thomas Vose of Sturgeon Bay, Wis., writing to the Chicago Chronicle, says: "I wish you would show me wherein the Chicago platform is in conflict with the principles advocated by Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, the Declaration of Independence or the constitution of the United States. I think it is time all true democrats should get together, and it is a thousand times better to go down in defeat adhering to the principles of Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln than to gain a victory without them." The Chronicle will find it quite difficult to give an intelligent answer to Mr. Vose's question.

Jefferson and Jackson.

Although Mr. Morgan is greatly disturbed because of the high tariff he must pay on his art collection, he is provided with a bit of consolation by the Indianapolis Sentinel. That newspaper says: "J. Pierpont Morgan complains that the tariff on works of art is 'extremely unjust and burdensome' because he is called upon to pay some \$3,000,000 of tariff on a lot of pictures and statuary he has been buying. But if it had not been for the tariff he would not have been able to buy them at all. It was the tariff that made possible his promotion of trusts, out of which he has made his enormous fortune."

Luxuries and Necessaries.

Referring to the report of the anthracite strike commission, the Chicago Record-Herald, a republican paper, says: "For aught that this investigation has accomplished the trust remains as impregnable as ever in its attitude toward the people, and it will take the advance in wages out of the people. The question now is, will the representatives of the people permit it to go on undisturbed in its defiance and infraction of the laws?" The representatives of the people will permit this trust to go on "undisturbed in its defiance and infraction of the laws" so long as the people choose their representatives from a party that derives its campaign funds from the trusts.

That is the Question.

A New York dispatch says: "William C. Whitney, Pierpont Morgan, Ashbel P. Fitch, William Rockefeller and other wealthy New Yorkers owning large estates in the Adirondacks have joined in making war on a bill now before the New York state legislature. The measure, if passed, would give wood pulp and water power speculators privileges which are worth millions. The result would be the devastation of large tracts in the Adirondacks, and this the millionaires are trying to prevent." It is strange how anxious these gentlemen are to prevent the devastation of large tracts in the Adirondacks and to prevent speculators from obtaining privileges which are worth millions. Perhaps, however, we may expect quite a vigorous warfare along this line until Mr. Morgan has time in which to organize a trust of his own which will be composed of persons to whom the delicate task of "the devastation of large tracts in the Adirondacks" could be with entire safety committed.

Anti-Monop. Monopolists.

The republican party has always boasted that it was in favor of reciprocity and in his annual message to congress President Roosevelt referred to reciprocity as the handmaiden of protection. But Senator Allison, in a recent interview, said: "Reciprocity is a beautiful theory, but I am convinced that it cannot be put into practice. The instant it is proposed to reduce the duty on any given dutiable product by means of a reciprocity treaty the industry affected immediately objects. Where a number of large industries are affected by the proposed reciprocity treaties they exert enough influence to defeat the treaties." Reciprocity is not the only thing republican leaders have written into their platform only after election to brand that which they once enthusiastically endorsed as beautiful in theory, but wholly impractical; and it is interesting to observe that Senator Allison intimates that reciprocity is impractical

Pledges and Theories.

because of the influences exerted by the industry affected. Public interests are not to be considered in the matter of reciprocity or any other proposed plan of action. The men who contribute to the republican campaign fund are the ones who exert enough influence to defeat the treaties.

A Washington dispatch to the New York American announces that an advisor close to the president has borne out the statement that J. Pierpont Morgan has induced the president to call an extra session of congress. It is alleged that the necessity for prompt ratification of the Cuban treaty is not the only purpose of holding this extra session. Mr. Morgan is deeply interested in the passage of the Aldrich finance bill and he is reported to have said that the passage of this measure was necessary in order to avoid serious monetary disturbances. Whenever the money power wants special legislation, its representatives undertake to frighten the people and make them believe that the measure proposed is designed purely for the public benefit, and sad to relate, there are all too many people who accept without question propositions having for their sole purpose the grant of new and extraordinary power to the financiers.

Morgan's Extra Session.

It would be well if the American people carefully studied the enormous appropriations made at the recent session of congress. Leslie's Weekly provides an interesting hint on this line when it says: "There is food for reflection in the fact that of the \$753,484,018 appropriated for various purposes at the last session of congress, \$307,704,309, or nearly one-half, was for expenses of wars past and preparations for possible wars to come. Nearly one-fifth of the total drafts upon the treasury, or \$139,847,600, was for the single item of pensions and over \$80,000,000 was for naval purposes. If we put over against these items the meager allowance of less than \$2,000,000 to keep up our notoriously underpaid and poorly sustained diplomatic and consular service and less than \$6,000,000 for the promotion of our vitally important agricultural interests, it looks, somehow, as if we were not so much given to cultivating the arts of peace as we sometimes credit ourselves with being."

War Costs Money.

The New York World directs attention to the fact that during the Spanish-American war, the Spanish bonds sold below 30. At the same time British bonds reached the maximum of 113 7-8, having gained on an average more than a point a year since they were "converted" in 1888. Soon after peace was declared, Spain found her credit unexpectedly and greatly improved, the year of 1902 Spanish bonds rose to 91 3-4. In the mean while Great Britain was engaged in the Boer war and her securities swelled in volume by the cost of killing. As a result during the year of 1902 Great Britain's bonds led the Spanish 4's by only 2 points and the British bonds have recently declined below 90, well beneath the Spanish maximum. The World well says that "some victories cost more than some defeats." The loss of her colonies was the best thing that could have happened to Spain and it will be many years before Great Britain will be exempt from the payment of penalty for her destruction of the two republics in South Africa.

The Cost of "Victory."

The reorganizers who pretend to be so anxious for harmony and say that in the accomplishment of that result, they desire only the concession that they be permitted to write the platform and choose the nominee for the party, may be interested in a story related by Colonel Julian S. Carr of Durham, N. C. Colonel Carr said: "There used to be an old fellow down in Wayne county, North Carolina, who had title deeds to several fine farms and mortgages on several others. He owned nearly all the land he could see from his front yard and when he had a chance he foreclosed a mortgage and added more land to his domain. One day a neighbor remarked to him: 'I suppose you would like to own the whole world, wouldn't you?' 'Oh, no,' answered the old fellow, 'I don't want to own the world. Not a bit. All I want is jest to own all the land that jines mine.'" The reorganizers do not demand many concessions. Not at all. They simply desire that they be placed in control of the party machinery, that they be permitted to dictate the nominees for president and vice president, and that they be given the privilege of framing the party platform.

They Do Not Ask Much.