

company, and who bought it for them under cover. This fact became known some months later. The International Harvester company also bought the Minne Harvester company of Minneapolis, Minn. In February, 1903, they bought secretly, the plant and business of D. M. Osborne & Co., of Auburn, N. Y., but this did not become known to the trade for eighteen months. During this period, they advertised the Osborne company as an independent company, and their advertisements bitterly attacked the Harvester trust. A great many dealers and farmers who were inclined to turn down trust goods, were induced to take up the Osborne goods, on the strength of the assurance that they were independent goods and did not belong to the trust. The trade were in ignorance of the true state of affairs until October 20, 1904, when the Implement Age exposed the whole deal and related facts which the Harvester trust later admitted.

IN THE FALL OF 1904 the International Harvester company bought the plant and business of the Keystone company of Sterling, Ill., independent manufacturers of harvesting machines. They also made this deal secretly and advertised the company as an independent company, and their advertisements were even more bitter against the Harvester trust than the advertisements of the Osborne company had been. Thus, the dealers and farmers were again hoodwinked and induced to take on trust goods, thinking that they were independent. The facts of the Keystone deal did not become known until the filing of the Swift bill against the International Harvester company in Chicago a few months ago. The Harvester trust has since admitted the Keystone deal. This makes nine companies which the International Harvester company has absorbed, and leaves only four independent companies in the field,

whereas before the organization of the International Harvester company, there were thirteen independent companies in the field, and competition was very fierce, the dealers and farmers getting the full benefit of the competitive fight. The International Harvester company of America, in their advertisement, have claimed that they are doing ninety per cent of the harvesting machinery business of the country, and have so stated in many of their letters.

BRIEFLY STATED, the case as presented by the Implement Age, is this: "In a fiercely competitive field, where there were thirteen competitive companies, a little group of men conspired together to destroy competition, and they have already taken nine companies from the field, and have secured in the neighborhood of ninety per cent of the business, controlling the prices and the output in a very large measure. Until this fall, they have had what is called an exclusive agency contract, which made the dealer who handled their machines, agree that he would handle no similar machines made by other manufacturers. Michigan, however, passed an exclusive contract law prohibiting such an agreement, and other states are contemplating similar measures, so this fall, the Harvester trust put out a contract which eliminated entirely this exclusive clause. Their power, however, is such, and their control of the trade is strong enough to enable them to enforce what was practically accomplished by the exclusive clause, and the same result is now secured verbally through their traveling representatives."

THE DUMMY SALE and purchase of \$800,000 of mercantile marine bonds made by George W. Perkins on behalf of the New York Life, to George W. Perkins on behalf of J. P.

Morgan & Co., for the purpose of "window dressing," the New York Life's report to the state insurance department was parallel to the offense which resulted in the conviction of the late Whitaker Wright, the English financier in London, on January 11, 1904. A writer in the New York World says that this view is sustained by eminent lawyers. This writer adds: "There is a general belief that 'window dressing' by corporations is not an offense here; but in the same Whitaker Wright case the United States supreme court decided that it is an offense under the laws of New York state. Whitaker Wright was arrested in this city and lodged in Ludlow street jail. He retained Samuel Untermyer to fight the extradition proceedings brought against him by the British government. The case was carried up to the United States supreme court. The records show that Mr. Untermyer based his argument against extradition on the fact that the treaty between the two countries provided that a person could only be extradited on a criminal charge where the laws of both countries made the act complained of a crime. Mr. Untermyer asserted there was no federal law against 'window dressing,' and that only six of all the states in the union had legally provided against it. The United States supreme court finally decided that 'window dressing' or the making of a false or deceptive report by a corporation was a crime under the laws of New York state and that as Whitaker Wright was arrested and held in New York state it was proper for him to be extradited. Had Whitaker Wright been arrested in any of the thirty-nine states which had made no provision against 'window dressing' he could not have been extradited. In view of the ruling of the United States supreme court on 'window dressing,' there is much curiosity in the financial district over the possibility of action by the authorities on Mr. Perkin's admissions."

## OKLAHOMA AND THE PRIMARY PLEDGE

Oklahoma stands fifth in the number of primary pledges returned to The Commoner office. The Commoner thanks the democrats of Oklahoma for the good work they have done along the lines of the primary pledge plan of organization. Those Oklahoma democrats who have already assisted are invited to renew their activities, while the many who have not participated in this good work are urged to lend a hand.

The appeal which The Commoner has made to the democrats of Missouri, of West Virginia, of Illinois and of Ohio it now makes to the democrats of Oklahoma. Every Oklahoma reader of The Commoner is requested to ask every Oklahoma democrat of his acquaintance to sign the primary pledge and call upon his own neighbor to do likewise. If a number of democrats of every Oklahoma county would organize for the purpose of circulating the primary pledge form in every precinct, obtaining the signature of every democrat who is willing to discharge his duty to his party, the field would be covered in a short time, and the results would count. Oklahoma democrats are reminded that this work of organization is not to terminate with the signing of the pledge. The interest of democrats once aroused is to be maintained, clubs are to be organized in every county of the state and in every precinct of the country, these clubs having for their purpose the promulgation of democratic principles and the protection of the democratic creed from those who would destroy it.

me five subscription cards and a hundred pledges. I wish you success.

Silas A. Cline, Danville, Ind.—You will find enclosed a list of the names of those who signed the primary pledge. All expressed the opinion that the thing to do is to attend all the primaries. Some of them said that if we had attended the primaries Mr. Parker would not have carried the vote of Indiana at the St. Louis convention.

P. T. Anderson, chairman democratic executive and central committee, St. Clairsville, O.—I take pleasure in mailing you three primary pledges. I consider The Commoner the greatest defense of the people.

Martin Graham, Granda, Colo.—Enclosed find my primary pledge.

Eck Brady, Stewardson, Ill.—I send you my primary pledge.

James Dailey, Kerby, Oregon—Enclosed find my primary pledge.

F. M. Hall, Mehama, Oregon—I send four signatures to the primary pledge.

J. V. Lynch, Weston, W. Va.—Please find enclosed primary pledge signed by twenty-four democrats. With the list I sent you recently,

this makes sixty in all. May this good work go on. May The Commoner be read by many thousand more democrats.

Austin Holmes, New Harmony, Ohio—Enclosed find fourteen primary pledges signed by as good democrats as there are in the state of Ohio, to each of whom I wish you would send a copy of your valuable paper.

Edward E. Tracy, attorney, Cheyenne, Okla.—Enclosed find the democratic primary pledge which I have signed. The Commoner is highly esteemed by the democracy of western Oklahoma and we are glad to endorse its patriotic efforts for reform.

Virgil Six, Abilene, Texas.—Please find enclosed \$1.35 for which you will please extend my subscription to The Commoner. I am doing all I can to push the democratic movement, and I believe we will elect a democrat in 1908. I send you two more primary pledges signed by old friends of mine. This makes four signers I have secured.

J. E. Warner, Findlay, Ohio—Enclosed find primary pledge. I hope to be able to vote for a good democrat in 1908. Success to The Commoner.

## THE PRIMARY PLEDGE

I promise to attend all the primaries of my party to be held between now and the next Democratic National Convention, unless unavoidably prevented, and to use my influence to secure a clear, honest and straightforward declaration of the party's position on every question upon which the voters of the party desire to speak.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Street \_\_\_\_\_ Postoffice \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

County \_\_\_\_\_ Voting precinct or ward \_\_\_\_\_

Fill out Blanks and mail to Commoner Office, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Extracts from letters received at The Commoner office follow:

Ole Helgesen, Washington, Calif.—I send you twenty primary pledge signatures.

Wille Viley, Lexington, Ky.—Enclosed find twenty signatures to the primary pledge.

I. H. Denton, Ingram, Tex.—Enclosed find thirteen primary pledges, my own having been sent in sometime ago.

A. S. Warren, Centerville Station, N. Y.—I am sixty-six years old and have never failed to vote the democratic ticket. I think The Commoner is doing great work for the people. I endorse the primary pledge plan.

James Smyzer, Moberly, Mo.—You will find enclosed the names of fifteen good democrats. These are democrats who are always in the front ranks for the principles of democracy. All we ask is that the democrats of the nation nominate a democrat instead of a galvanized republican. If the democrats do this we will pull off our coats and roll up our sleeves and give him 65,000 majority in Missouri. Please send