of labor and of capital; no unequal discrimination; no abuse of the powers of law for favoritism or oppression."

Senator Allison has a reputation of being able to walk on eggs without breaking them, and this plank, if it appeared anywhere else than in a democratic platform, might be attributed to him for it is about as nice a piece of balancing as has appeared in many a day. The party stands "impartially" between labor and capital. If any discrimination is made, it must not be an "unequal" discrimination. That is, if the party discriminates in favor of one side, it must offset it by an equal discrimination in favor of the other side. There must be no abuse of the powers of the law, either for favoritism or oppression. Why this prodigality in the use of type? If the convention had said that it was in favor of doing right as between capital and labor, the plank would have been just as clear and just as useful as a guide to the party. In fact, the whole platform is so noncommital, so absolutely colorless and so capable of being construed in any way that "we will do right" would have answered as well for the whole platform. A republican could run on that platform and after the election construe it as an indorsement of every policy for which the republican party stands, or at least he could find nothing in that platform that would rebuke him for doing anything that a republican might want to do.

What are the issues before the country? The trust question is certainly an issue, and yet there is nothing in that platform that gives any encouragement to the opponents of the trusts. There is not a word or syllable that binds a person elected on such a platform to do anything that the trusts are unwilling to have done. The Kansas City platform stated the party's position on the trust question, but the New York platform not only fails to indorse the last national platform, but also fails to propose any definite or positive plan of relief.

Imperialism is an issue. Our government is now administering a colonial policy according to the political principles employed by George III. a century and a quarter ago, and yet there is not in this platform a single word relating to the question of imperialism, not a plank that defines the party's position on that subject, not a protest against the surrender of the doctrines of self-government. The Kansas City platform stated the party's opposition to a colonial policy, but the New York platform not only fails to indorse the Kansas City platform, but fails to take any position at all on this important question.

The labor question is an issue. The laboring men have been before the committees of congress endeavoring to secure three important measures. One, the arbitration of differences between corporations engaged in interstate commerce and their employes. Both the Chicago and Kansas City platforms declared in favor of arbitration, but the New York platform not only fails to refer to the arbitration plank of these platforms, but it fails to write a new plank covering this subject.

The laboring men are also trying to secure an eight-hour day, but the New York platform is silent on this subject.

The laboring men are trying to secure the abolition of government by injunction. Both the Chicago and Kansas City platforms contained planks on this subject, but the New York platform dodges this as it does all other vital questions. As the capitalists now have what they want and are in the position of defendants in a suit, while the laboring men are in the attitude of plaintiffs seeking relief, the failure of the New York platform to advocate what the laboring men desire is really a declaration against them.

On the tariff question no issue is joined. It was reasonable to suppose that on this question, at least, something would be said, but Mr. Hill and Judge Parker seem to be as much afraid of the tariff question as of other issues.

The money question is ignored entirely. No reference is made to bimetallism at any ratio—not even to international bimetallism to which Mr. Hill seemed to be so attached in the Chicago convention. No reference is made to the measure now before congress to melt up nearly six hundred million legal tender silver dollars into subsidiary coin that is only a limited legal tender. Nothing is said about the asset currency which is a part of the scheme of the financiers Nothing is said about the Aldrich bill which proposes to subsidize the banks into opposition to tax reduction by loaning them the surplus money in the treasury. There is no condemnation of the corruption that such a system would lead to. The platform does not antagonize the proposition now before congress to give the national banks unlimited control over the volume of paper money. In other words, there is not a line in the platform that is written in behalf of the people; not a line that will excite criticism in Wall street.

The platform ignores the income tax; it fails to indorse the election of senators by direct vote and also omits the plank of the Kansas City platform denouncing corporate domination in politics.

The New York platform is a dishonest platform, fit only for a dishonest party. No one but an artful dodger would stand upon it. The submission of such a platform to the voters of a state is an insult to their intelligence, for it is intended to deceive them, and a deliberate attempt to deceive—especially so clumsy an attempt as this platform is—is a reflection upon the brains of those to whom it is submitted.

This platform proves that the opposition to the Kansas City platform is not opposition to silver, but opposition to every needed reform and opposition to all that the masses desire.

I had expected that a platform prepared by Mr. Hill for Judge Parker would be evasive and lacking in frankness, but I did not conceive that any body of men calling themselves democrats would present such a platform as a recommendation of a candidate. If we are to take the New York platform as an indication of what the next democratic platform is to be, in case the reorganizers control the convention, then who will be able to deny the secret purpose of the reorganizers to turn the party over to predatory wealth? It is to this danger that I desire to call your attention tonight. With such a platform and a candidate who would be willing to run upon it, the party could secure as large a campaign fund as the republican party has ever secured, but in securing it it would, like the republican party, secretly pledge the administration to a construction of the platform satisfactory to the corporations and the combinations. If you would know why the corporations contribute to campaign funds, read the testimony given by Mr. H. O. Hayemeyer before the senate committee in the spring of 1894. The answers made by Mr. Havemeyer to Senator Allen's questions are conclusive as to the purpose of the campaign contributions made by the great corporations:

Senator Allen: "Therefore, you feel at liberty to contribute to both parties?"

Mr. Hayemeyer: "It depends. In the state of New York, where the democratic majority is between 40,000 and 50,000, we throw it their way. In the state of Massachusetts, where the republican party is doubtful, tney probably have the call."

Senator Allen: "In the state of Massachusetts do you contribute anything?"

Mr. Havemeyer: "Very likely.

Senator Allen: "What is your best recollection as to contributinns made by your company in the state of Massachusetts?"

Mr. Havemeyer: "I could not name the amount."

Senator Allen: "However, in the state of New York you contribute to the democratic party, and in the commonwealth of Massachusetts you contribute to the republican party?"

Mr. Havemeyer: "It is my impression that wherever there is a dominant party, wherever the majority is very large, that is the party that gets the contribution, because that is the party which controls the local matters."

Senator Allen: "Then, the sugar trust is a democrat in a democratic state, and a republican in a republican state?"

Mr. Havemeyer: "As far as local matters are concerned, I think that is about it."

Senator Allen: "In the state of your nativity, or the nativity of your corporation, New Jersey, where do your contributions go?"

Mr. Havemeyer: "I will have to look that up."

Senator Allen: "I understand New Jersey is invariably a democratic state. It would naturally go to the democratic party?"

Mr. Havemeyer: "Under the theory I have suggested if they were there it would naturally go to them."

Here we have the head of the sugar trust admitting that his corporation contributes to campaign funds and that its contribution is determined, not by political convictions, but by its desire to stand in with the winning party. Senator Allen tried to ascertain the amounts contributed to the various campaign funds, but Mr. Havemeyer refused to answer.

The two republiacn members of the committee, Senator Davis and Senator Lodge, joined Senator Allen in calling the matter to the attention of the attorney general for the District of Columbia. Senator Allen individually reported a resolution in favor of calling the witness before the senate for contempt, but Senator Gray and Senator Lindsey, both gold democrats, presented a minority report in which they opposed taking any action in regard to the witness.

If you desire further testimony in regard to the purpose of corporations in contributing, you will find it in a letter sent by Mr. A. B. Hepburn of the National City Bank of New York to Lyman J. Gage, secretary of the treasury. The letter bears date of June 5, 1897, and is published in House Document 264 of the first session of the 56th congress. In closing the letter, after asking for deposits, Mr. Hepburn says: "Of course the bank is very strong, and if you will take the pains to look at our list of directors you will see that we also have great political claims in view of what was done in the campaign last year."

Here is the president of the most influential bank in the country calling attention to political service rendered by the directors of the bank as a reason why the bank should be remembered in the distribution of government money. Now, with the testimony of the head of one of the great trusts and the testimony of an official of one of the great banks, can any one doubt that contributions are made by the corporations for the purpose of controlling the policy of the party after the election? Can any one doubt that with such a platform as was adopted in New York, and with a candidate whose conscience would permit him to run upon such a platform—does any one doubt that with such a platform and candidate the party would be mortgaged beforehand to the corporations that are now using the government as a private asset and plundering the people at will?

But there is another reason why the democratic party cannot afford to go before the country with an ambiguous platform and an uncertain candidate. No matter how people may differ as to the relative importance of issues, all must recognize that the trust question today presents an important phase of the great conflict between plutocracy and democracy. We have recently had a supreme court decision on the merger case. This decision was rendered by a bare majority of one, and that one (Judge Brewer) in a separete opinion has stated his position in such a way as to leave no doubt that in the first case involving a trust he may join the minority and defeat the Sherman law. Judge Brewer construes the anti-trust law to apply only to reasonable restraint of trade. He would have the court decide whether the restraint is reasonable or unreasonable. His decision, taken in connection with the dissenting opinions of Justices Fuller, Peckham, White, and Holmes, shows that the appointment of a new judge might throw the decision to the one side or to the other. The judges of the supreme court are appointed by the president, and the president to be elected this fall will doubtless have the appointment of one or two, and possibly three, supreme court judges. If his sympathies are with the corporations he will doubtless appoint judges satisfactory to the corporations—especially if he is obligated to the corporations by large campaign contributions—and these judges can make it impossible to secure any remedial legislation for years to come. If, four years hence, the people should secure a president, a senate, and a house opposed to private monopolies, they may find themselves unable to get any remedial legislation past the supreme court for several years.

The opinion filed by Judge White and concurred in by the others denies the power of congress over monopolies organized in a state. These dissenting judges insist that congress has no power to regulate or restrain the creation of a monopoly within a state. It will be remembered that the decision in the Knight case, known as the sugar trust case, turned upon that very question. It was admitted in that case that the sugar trust controlled the producion of sugar, but the court held that the Sherman law did not prevent the buying up of the individual refineries even though the product of the refineries might ultimately enter into interstate commerce.

The division of the supreme court in the merger case shows the cleavage on the trust question. The dissenting judges would deny the power of congress to prevent a private monopoly and when the power of congress to destroy monopolies is denied the people are left helpless because some of the states, such as Delaware and New Jersey, find it profitable to permit the creation of these monopolies and so long as they are created and can evade federal laws no separate state can fully protect itself against them.

The dissenting judges in the merger case refuse to draw a distinction between an individual and a corporation. Justice White says: "The principle that the ownership of property is embraced within the power of congress to regulate