

bonds. We are receiving from shrewd business men from the large trading centers, monthly orders for certificates, they claiming that the investment is safer and the possibility of large gain greater than investment in bonds, life insurance or any of the speculative stocks offered on the boards of trade in the various commercial centers. Most of them purchase certificates systematically, that is, send in every month for from one to five dollars' worth. Almost every one can economize a few cents a day, and the funds thus saved can be invested in certificates, and with a hundred or more certificates in your possession you are likely to wake up some morning and find yourself the lucky possessor of an independent fortune. It hardly seems reasonable that with a hundred certificates one could miss ALL of the 1,889 prizes."

Please let me know whether the department has issued any order on the subject and whether or not such a contest is regarded as a violation of the anti-lottery laws. Yours truly,

W. J. BRYAN.

**The Answer.**

Office of the Assistant Attorney General for the Postoffice Department, Washington, D. C., June 23, 1903. Your communication of the 10th inst. addressed to the postmaster general, submitting a circular of the World's Fair Contest company, Saint Louis, Missouri, and expressing the view that the prize scheme advertised therein is a lottery, has been referred to this office.

It is unquestionable that the effect upon the public of these so-called gessing contests—considering the elaborate plan upon which they are operated, the very large prizes offered, etc.—is almost as pernicious as that of ordinary lotteries, and it is the disposition of the postoffice department to scrutinize very carefully all such schemes and to deny them the use of the United States mails where authority of law can be found for so doing. You of course understand, however, that in all such cases the department must be governed by decisions of the federal courts and opinions of law officers of the government.

In this connection your attention is directed to the opinion of Attorney General Miller, 19 Opinions of Attys-Gen. 679; opinion of Attorney General Griggs, 23 Opinions of Attys-Gen. 207; opinion of Attorney General Knox, 23 Opinions of Attys-Gen. 492; and to the decision of the United States circuit court for the southern district of New York, in United States vs. Rosenblum, set forth in the inclosed circular.

From a consideration of the authorities above cited you will observe that the scheme to which you call attention is beyond the reach of the postoffice department, unless it shall develop that fraud is being practiced in its operation. Very respectfully,

C. H. ROBB,  
Assistant Attorney General for the Postoffice department.  
Hon. William J. Bryan, Lincoln, Neb.

**An Interesting Dispute.**

Rev. Newell Dwight Hillis of the Plymouth church, Brooklyn, and Senator Chauncey Depew are engaged in an interesting dispute as to the effect of great wealth. Dr. Hillis said in a sermon recently:

"I want to say that we will all go to the devil on \$50,000 a year—at least a great many men I know are going to the devil on that sum—and very few are escaping it. Once a man has an income of that much money a year, he is apt to forget, in the same way that a man forgets to say grace after he has dined.

"Today we are raising pampered sons and daughters, surrounding them with every luxury and idle satisfaction of the decade and they are rotten before they are ripe. I repeat it—they are rotten before they are ripe—and the boys in many cases are sinful before they are bearded.

"They practice the ten commandments with the 'shall nots' left out and I warn them that in the future they will find that God and nature practice the ten commandments, but the 'shall nots' are left in.

"I cannot pick up a paper, but that I see the '400' of this city engaged in divorce suits.

"I tremble for my country when all the work the preacher does at one end in marrying the judge undoes at the other end in the divorce-court.

"If the women of my congregation who are suffering with nervous prostration had the will power to take nine out of every ten of their frocks into the back yard and burn

them, I do not think they would longer be troubled with their nervous prostration."

This is pretty strong language for the pastor of a prominent New York church, and no one who is familiar with the situation can doubt that there is truth in what he says.

Now comes Senator Chauncey Depew with his reply. He says:

"It all amounts to this: Whether a man has, first, an inclination to go to the devil; or, secondly, will power enough to resist the temptations to take him there. If a man possesses the first or lacks the second condition, he can just as well go to the devil on \$10,000 a year as on \$100,000."

He then goes on to argue that the sons of the very rich are less liable to dissipation than the sons of families of moderate means who come in from the country. The trouble with Senator Depew's argument is that he does not give enough consideration to his second proposition. Very few men have an inclination to go to the devil; the great trouble is that they yield to temptation, and the temptations that come to those who are idle are greater than the temptations that come to those who are necessarily occupied.

The divorce suits that seem to be so frequent among the "400" are large! due to the fact that having no useful employment and spending their time in the search of pleasure they fail to find any real enjoyment at home or anywhere else. The temptations of such a life are not only greater than the temptations that come to those whose hands and thoughts are occupied, but the strength to resist temptation is also weakened by high living.

**Reed's Fortune.**

The following item concerning the value of ex-Speaker Reed's estate appears in the press dispatches:

The report filed by the appraisers appointed by the surrogate's court to value the estate left by Thomas B. Reed, once speaker of the house of representatives, and for some years prior to his death practicing law in this city, shows that Mr. Reed left a personal estate valued at \$431,099, after provision had been made for the payment of debts and the expenses of the administration of the property. The gross personalty amounted to \$629,533.

The principal items comprising the estate, which consists chiefly of bonds and securities, are: 900 shares of Northern Securities, valued at \$95,850; 200 shares of American Car and Foundry company, preferred, \$77,800; 1,000 shares of American Smelting and Refining company, \$38,000; 600 shares of Metropolitan Securities company, \$18,187; 1,200 shares of Metropolitan Street Railway, \$167,250; 400 shares of Brooklyn Union Gas company, \$90,000, and 100 shares Great Northern Paper company, \$100,000.

Mr. Reed died last December. By his will he left any property he was possessed of to his widow. His will was executed many years before his death.

Mr. Reed's investments show that he did not entertain any prejudice against the trusts. Well, he did not show any prejudice against the corporations during his speakership. In fact, while he differed from the republican leaders on the question of imperialism, he was in hearty sympathy with them on all questions effecting corporations and monopolies.

The report does not explain how Mr. Reed accumulated so much, or whether the accumulation occurred during his membership in congress or afterwards. If the source of his income, as well as the amount of his estate, had been given, the public could better judge whether his fortune was due to the practice of economy while he was drawing \$5,000 a year, or to the literary and professional work since he retired, or to speculation.

**The Tariff Logicians.**

The St. Louis Star has attempted to explain how a tariff on manufactured products makes manufactured products cheaper by stimulating competition and at the same time makes wheat dearer by preventing competition. But its explanations are as lame as the explanations of the protectionists usually are. The price of wheat is fixed abroad. Whether the farmer sells to the miller in his home state or to the miller in Europe he gets the foreign price less carriage and commissions. The republicans try to show that

a tariff on wheat raises the price of the farmer's wheat and then they try to show the farmer that a tariff lowers the price of manufactured products. They make the same argument in regard to wool. They do not put the arguments side by side, but in the course of the same speech they will assert that a tariff on wool raises the price of wool and that a tariff on the goods made out of the same wool lowers the price of the goods. They make these contradictory arguments not because there is any truth in them, but because they have to deceive the farmer. The manufacturers understand the necessity for such arguments and overlook them, but republican farmers are expected to accept them at their face value.

**Slavery in the Philippines.**

The Buffalo Express comments upon the new government to be established among the Moros and says that "the new council will be authorized to abolish slavery," and it adds: "This is not only a confession that slavery has continued to exist under the American flag, but apparently there has not even been authority to abolish it hitherto." The Express then proceeds to quote the constitution on the subject and says:

"Not all the advantage which the possession of the Philippines can possibly bring to the United States could offset the harm done by this demonstration that the military power can violate the most explicit and essential clauses of the constitution with impunity."

The Express ought to have learned before this that colonies are governed outside of the constitution and that it is a very thing that the democratic party has been objecting to.

**A Warning From Wealth.**

The New York Post recently printed an editorial entitled "Monopoly and Socialism." The editor of the Post speaks of the action of the socialists in hailing "a leading Wall street organizer as a fellow-worker in a good cause," and points out that there is really more truth than irony in it. The extortion of gas, water and lighting companies did more to accelerate the movement in favor of municipal ownership than all the abstract arguments that could have been made. And so Morgan, Hill and other railroad magnates have done more to create the sentiment in favor of the government ownership of railroads than either the populist or the socialist party. The Post points the truth none too strongly when it says:

"The destroyers of competition are the real enemies of our existing social system. It is they that individualists have to dread more than the street-corner orator, or the peddler of socialistic literature, or the foreign enthusiasts who have come here to organize American workingmen for the coming revolution. Those republican senators who are so disturbed at the growth of the socialist vote would do well to look first to some of their own associates and their own methods. Every man who works to create a monopoly or who, in its name, exacts the uttermost farthing, is the most dangerous propagator of socialism known today."

It is time that the republicans who have been blindly following their leaders should consider the question: "Is competition an evil or a good?" They cannot support monopolies without believing that competition is an evil, and the moment they decide that a monopoly is good they are face to face with a choice between a government monopoly and a private monopoly.

On the other hand, if the republicans decide that competition is good, then they must exert themselves to protect it, for competition is being fast destroyed by organized and concentrated wealth. The democratic party has declared that private monopolies are indefensible and intolerable; will the republicans take the same position, or will they hasten the issue between public and private monopolies by permitting the industries of the country to be gathered into a few hands?

The democratic party has been the champion of competition where competition is possible, but it can never be the champion of private monopolies, for to champion private monopolies would simply be to turn the people over to the tender mercies of the greedy and the avaricious.

When a paper like the Post, a thick and thin advocate of the moneyed classes, begins to see danger in the rapid growth toward private monopolies it is time that the republican organs in the rural districts sound a warning to their party.