

over the merger decision, but what is there in it to cause exultation among republicans? Why does not the president enforce the law if the law is good? Why are the numerous great trusts allowed to continue business? If the governor of a state enforced the law against one horse thief in ten or twenty or one hundred, could he excuse himself for not enforcing it against the other nine or nineteen or ninety-nine? The reason for the republican inaction is plain to be seen. The party receives campaign contributions from trusts. Trust officials and financiers lend to the republican leaders their power to coerce employes and to intimidate borrowers. Will the democratic party imitate republican methods and invite confidence only to betray it, or will it take a firm and strong stand against the commercialism of the day and make a resolute attempt to restore the government to its old foundations and to purify politics? The democratic party has two paths before it. It can follow the republican party upon the downward path or it can take the path leading to higher ground. In the last two campaigns the party has made a strenuous fight for higher ideals, but its way has been obstructed and made hard by the perfidy of men once high in the party's councils and by the betrayal of men of whom it had a right to expect nought but fidelity. It must continue its struggle or forfeit its claim upon the conscience of the country. There is every inducement to a righteous course. It cannot only secure to its members the satisfaction that comes from noble effort, but it can lay the foundation for permanent and overwhelming success. Indications point with increasing clearness to the control of the next national convention by the democratic democrats of the party, but to make the certainty sure, every believer in democratic principles, every fearless exponent of the rights of the people, ought to work incessantly until the convention meets. This is no time for over-confidence or idleness. If the party would realize the hopes of its founders and prove an effective instrument for the improvement of government and the betterment of political conditions, the order must be no compromise, concession or surrender, but forward, march!

### /// Dropping the Mask.

It is impossible for the organs of the reorganizers to conceal their real purpose. Pretending that their chief objection to the Kansas City platform is on the money plank, they cannot hide the fact that they are just as vigorously opposed to the democratic party's position on the trust question as they are to its position on the money question.

The Brooklyn Eagle, recognized as one of the leaders of the reorganizing element, boldly indorses the Foraker bill, now pending in the senate. The Foraker bill, in brief, nullifies the Sherman anti-trust law, directly repeals the criminal clause of that law and, bluntly stated, provides that the trust magnates may conspire in restraint of trade, provided they do so in a "reasonable" degree.

In an editorial printed in its issue of March 17, the Brooklyn Eagle maintains that "the power to violate the laws of congress in restraint of trade should not be held to be an intention to violate them and should not, in itself, be a violation of them." The Eagle does not approve of the opinion delivered by Justice Harlan in the Northern Securities merger case. It says:

"It is, therefore, desirable that the Foraker bill should be passed by congress as soon as possible for the reputation of the United States, for the sake of justice, for the prosperity of business and for the reconciliation of law with logic, of construction of law with sanity and of the administration of law with reason and with right."

In the opinion of the reorganizers, as well stated by the Brooklyn Eagle, justice is upheld, business prosperity is secured, law is reconciled with logic, the construction of law is made with sanity, the administration of law is in accordance with reason and with right, whenever the trust magnate is given the power to violate the law and the privilege of freedom from punishment when the violation is "reasonable," in the opinion of a judge whom the trust magnates may concede to be sufficiently "conservative" to pass upon the acts of a "trustee of God."

### /// Give Us the Figures.

The chief argument advanced by those who advocate a protective tariff is that it benefits the wage-workers. But they are slow about producing tangible proof.

Under the tariff on steel rails, American manu-

facturers charge home consumers \$28 per ton. The same rails are sold to Canada for \$21 a ton, and to Great Britain or South Africa for \$18 a ton, on board the cars at the point of manufacture.

How much of the \$28 charged the domestic consumer goes to the laborers who make the rails?

How much of the \$21 charged the Canadian government goes to the laborers who make the rails?

How much of the \$18 charged the Briton or the Afrikaner goes to the laborers who make the rails?

Is it not true that the laborers who are engaged in making the \$18 rails get just as much for their work as the men who make the \$28 rails? And if the men who make the \$28 rails get no more than the men who make the \$18 rails, who but the manufacturer is benefited by the tariff? And if the tariff enables the manufacturer to charge an exorbitant price for his product, upon whom does the burden fall? Necessarily upon the people, for the railroads who have to pay the high domestic price shoulder it off upon the people in extortionate freight rates.

But let some advocate of the robber tariff explain why, if the tariff is beneficial to labor, the men who roll the \$28 rails for American consumers get no more wages than the men who roll rails for the foreign consumer. Advocates of the tariff should be willing to let glittering generalities rest for a time and give a few plain facts.

### /// Birds of a Feather.

The Cincinnati Enquirer prints the following "special dispatch" from New York:

"New York, March 17.—According to an interview credited to James J. Hill, president of the Northern Securities company, and of the Great Northern railroad, he is in favor of the nomination of Grover Cleveland for the presidency.

"It is my belief," said Mr. Hill, "that Mr. Cleveland would make a very strong candidate with the people. They know him; they know his ability. He has been in that office before and he filled it in a manner that must have impressed the people in general. He was conservative in his administration and demonstrated unusual ability, not to say greatness.

"The people know what to expect of him, which is more than can be said of the other candidates, and which, I believe, is a strong point in his favor. I believe that his nomination would be the strongest that the democratic party could make, and I think the people would indorse the selection at the polls."

Of course, Mr. Hill admires Mr. Cleveland. "Birds of a feather flock together." Mr. Cleveland is doubtless a great admirer of Mr. Hill and it might be interesting to know whether Mr. Cleveland had any stock in the Northern Pacific when the merger was planned and whether he sold it or kept it. If some enterprising reporters will secure a signed statement from the ex-president declaring, first, whether he held a block of Northern Pacific just prior to the merger; second, whether he sold it about that time and, if so, at what profit above purchase price, it might prove more interesting reading than Mr. Cleveland's recent article on the democratic opportunity. Or, if he does not want to discuss this phase of the "money question," he might take the public into his confidence and say whether he indorses the dissenting opinions of the three judges whom he appointed to the supreme court, and whether he would, if "forced" into the presidency again, appoint judges who would favor mergers.

Mr. Cleveland wants a platform "free from the taint of jugglery." It will be some time before he is called upon to write a democratic platform, but he might try his hand upon a plain statement covering the above points.

### /// The Kansas City Platform.

On another page will be found the Kansas City platform, about which so much has been said by the gold and corporation democrats and about which they seem to know so little. It might be well for the friends of that platform to carry this platform with them, and when they find a man who is opposed to the platform, they can ask him to point out what particular part he is opposed to, and when he objects to any plank, let him be requested to write out a substitute for that plank.

The Kansas City platform states with extraordinary force and clearness the issues between

the parties, and any attempt to re-write it is likely to make it weaker rather than stronger. The reaffirmation of the platform covers all the planks in it, and the old platform would be taken in connection with such additions as may be made. If the platform is not reaffirmed, then all that is not restated would be considered as repudiated, and what can we afford to repudiate? Is bimetalism wrong? If so, why not repudiate it expressly, and if right, how can the party's position be better stated on that subject? Is the trust remedy proposed in that platform objectionable? If so, what better remedy for the reorganizers to propose? They not only have no other remedy, but their political idol, when president, appointed three judges who dissented from the opinion sustaining the anti-trust law in the merger case.

Nobody need be ashamed of the Kansas City platform. It would, however, be a matter of shame if a great political party with more than six million members could be frightened by the trust magnates and financiers and made to run from so sound and democratic an utterance as the Kansas City platform.

### /// "Sneers and Jeers."

In its issue of March 16, the New York World printed an editorial entitled "Facts," as follows:

1. The anti-trust law was framed by a republican, was passed by a republican house and a republican senate, was signed by a republican president.

2. The law remained a dead letter on the statute books during the entire second term of Grover Cleveland, a democratic president. Through those four years of democratic administration all appeals and all efforts of the World to have the law enforced were met with sneers, jeers and open contempt from a democratic attorney general, Richard Olney, who pretended that the law was unconstitutional, and who would do nothing toward prosecuting violators of it.

3. The first effort to enforce the law was made by Theodore Roosevelt, a republican president. The first attorney general to vigorously prosecute offenders and to test the law was a republican attorney general, Philander C. Knox.

4. The decision of the supreme court of the United States, given as a finality from which there is no appeal, upholding the law as perfectly constitutional and absolutely impregnable in every respect, as the World for twelve years constantly insisted, was due to five judges, every one of whom is a republican.

5. The dissenting minority of the court included every democratic judge of that tribunal, to-wit: Chief Justice Fuller of Illinois, Mr. Justice White of Louisiana, and Mr. Justice Peckham of New York. All these distinguished democrats not only voted against the constitutionality of the law, but denounced it as a danger to the republic.

6. Under these circumstances it does not seem probable that the democrats can make great capital in seeking to monopolize the anti-trust issue and charging the republican party with the crime of being owned body and soul by the trusts.

It is just as well to record some plain truths, however unpleasant or surprising.

The World has insisted that the democratic party nominate for president Grover Cleveland or some one in harmony with Mr. Cleveland's views on public questions.

Yet, that newspaper tells us that during the entire second term of Grover Cleveland, the anti-trust law remained a dead letter on the statute books; that all efforts and appeals to have the law enforced "were met with sneers, jeers and open contempt from a democratic attorney general," and that the justices who took the trust side of the question were appointees of Grover Cleveland.

In the face of these facts, will the World continue to insist that the only hope for the democratic party is that it surrender itself into the keeping of those who meet "with sneers, jeers and open contempt" appeals that the laws against the trusts be enforced?

The World has already told its readers that the Kansas City platform must be abandoned, pretending that its objections are based on the money plank of that platform. Yet, in this editorial, the World says that democrats cannot make a successful fight on the trust issue. Are we to understand that the World would have the democratic party abandon that issue? Are we to understand that the World would have the party pretend to be against the trusts, at