

of predatory wealth and that it even now contains so many members who owe their election to favor-seeking corporations and are so subservient to their masters as to prevent needed legislation. The popular branch of congress has four times declared in favor of this reform by a two-thirds vote and more than two-thirds of the states have demanded it, and yet the senate arrogantly and impudently blocks the way.

"The income tax, which some in our country have denounced as a socialistic attack upon wealth, has, I am pleased to report, the endorsement of the most conservative countries in the old world. It is a permanent part of the fiscal system of most of the countries of Europe and in many places it is a graded tax, the rate being highest upon the largest incomes. England has long depended upon the income tax for a considerable part of her revenues and the English commission is now investigating the proposition to change from a uniform to a graded tax.

"I have been absent too long to speak with any authority on the public sentiment in this country at this time, but I am so convinced of the justice of the income tax that I feel sure that the people will sooner or later demand an amendment to the constitution which will specifically authorize an income tax and thus make it possible for the burdens of the federal government to be apportioned among the people in proportion to their ability to bear them. It is little short of a disgrace to our country that while it is able to command the lives of its citizens in time of war, it can not, even in the most extreme emergency, compel wealth to bear its share of the expenses of the government which protects it.

"I have referred to the investigation of international controversies under a system which does not bind the parties to accept the findings of the court of inquiry. This plan can be used in disputes between labor and capital; in fact, it was proposed as a means of settling such disputes before it was applied to international controversies. It is as important that we shall have peace at home as that we shall live peaceably with neighboring nations, and peace is only possible when it rests upon justice. In advocating arbitration of differences between large corporate employers and their employes, I believe we are defending the highest interests of the three parties to these disputes, viz: the employers, the employes and the public. The employe can not be turned over to the employer to be dealt with as the employer may please.

"The question sometimes asked, 'Can I not conduct my business to suit myself?' is a plausible one, but when a man in conducting his business attempts to arbitrarily fix the conditions under which hundreds of employes are to live and to determine the future of thousands of human beings, I answer without hesitation that he has no right to conduct his own business in such a way as to deprive his employes of the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. To support this position, I need only refer to the laws regulating the safety of mines, the factory laws fixing the age at which children can be employed, and usury laws establishing the rate of interest. The effort of the employer to settle differences without arbitration has done much to embitter him against those who work for him and to estrange them from him—a condition deplorable from every standpoint.

"But if it is unwise to make the employer the sole custodian of the rights and interests of the employes, it is equally unwise to give the employes uncontrolled authority over the rights and interests of the employer. The employes are no more to be trusted to act unselfishly and disinterestedly than the employers. In their zeal to secure a present advantage they may not only do injustice but even forfeit a larger future gain.

"The strike, the only weapon of the employe at present, is a two-edged sword and may injure the workman as much as the employer, and even when wholly successful, is apt to leave a rankling in the bosom of the wage-earner that ought not to be. Society has, moreover, something at stake as well as the employer and employe, for there can be no considerable strike without considerable loss to the public. Society, therefore, is justified in demanding that the differences between capital and labor shall be settled by peaceful means. If a permanent, impartial board is created, to which either party of an industrial dispute may appeal or which can of its motion institute an inquiry, public opinion may be relied upon to enforce the finding. If there is compulsory submission to investigation it is not necessary that there shall be compulsory acceptance of the decision, for a full and fair investigation will, in almost every case, bring about a settlement.

"No reference to the labor question is com-

plete that does not include some mention of what is known as government by injunction. As the main purpose of the writ is to evade trial by jury, it is really an attack upon the jury system and ought to arouse a unanimous protest. However, as the writ is usually invoked in case of a strike the importance of the subject would be very much reduced by the adoption of a system of arbitration, because arbitration would very much reduce, even if it did not entirely remove, the probability of a strike.

"Just another word in regard to the laboring man. The struggle to secure an eight hour day is an international struggle and it is sure to be settled in favor of the workingman's contention. The benefits of the labor saving machine have not been distributed with equity. The producer has enormously multiplied his capacity, but so far the owner of the machine has received too much of the increase and the laborer too little. Those who oppose the eight hour day do it, I am convinced, more because of ignorance of conditions than because of lack of sympathy with those who toil. The removal of work from the house to the factory has separated the husband from his wife and the father from his children, while the growth of our cities has put an increasing distance between the home and the workshop. Then, too, more is demanded of the laboring man now than formerly. He is a citizen as well as a laborer, and must have time for the study of public questions if he is to be an intelligent sovereign. To drive him from his bed to his task and from his task to his bed is to deprive the family of his companionship, society of his service and politics of his influence.

"Thus far I have dwelt upon subjects which may not be regarded as strictly partisan, but I am sure that you will pardon me if in this presence I betray my interest in those policies for which the democratic party stands. I have not had an opportunity to make a democratic speech for almost a year, and no one—not even a political enemy—could be so cruel as to forbid me to speak of those policies on this occasion. Our opponents have derived not only partisan pleasure, but partisan advantage as well from the division caused in our party by the money question. They ought not, therefore, begrudge us the satisfaction that we find in the fact that unexpected conditions have removed the cause of our differences and permitted us to present a united front on present issues. The unlooked for and unprecedented increase in the production of gold has brought a victory to both the advocates of gold and the advocates of bimetallism—the former keeping the gold standard which they wanted and the latter securing the larger volume of money for which they contended. We who favor bimetallism are satisfied with our victory if the friends of monometallism are satisfied with theirs. And we can invite them to a contest of zeal and endurance in the effort to restore to the people the rights which have been gradually taken from them by the trusts.

"The investigations which have been in progress during the past year have disclosed the business methods of those who a few years ago resented any inspection of their schemes and hid their rascality under high-sounding phrases. These investigations have also disclosed the source of enormous campaign funds which have been used to debauch elections and corrupt the ballot. The people see now what they should have seen before, namely, that no party can exterminate the trusts so long as it owes its political success to campaign contributions secured from the trusts. The great corporations do not contribute their money to any party except for immunity expressly promised or clearly implied. The president has recommended legislation on this subject, but so far his party has failed to respond.

"No important advance can be made until this corrupting influence is eliminated and I hope that the democratic party will not only challenge the republican party to bring forward effective legislation on this subject, but will set an example by refusing to receive campaign contributions from corporations and by opening the books so that every contributor of any considerable sum may be known to the public before the election. The great majority of corporations are engaged in legitimate business and have nothing to fear from hostile legislation and they should not be permitted to use the money of the stockholders to advance the political opinions of the officers of the corporations. Contributions should be individual, not corporate, and no party can afford to receive contributions even from individuals when the acceptance of those contributions secretly pledge the party to a course which it can not openly avow. In other words, politics should be honest, and I mistake political

conditions in America if they do not presage improvement in the conduct of campaigns.

"While men may differ as to the relative importance of issues, and while the next congress will largely shape the lines upon which the next presidential campaign will be fought, I think it is safe to say that at present the paramount issue, in the minds of a large majority of the people, is the trust issue.

"I congratulate President Roosevelt upon the steps which he has taken to enforce the anti-trust law and my gratification is not lessened by the fact that he has followed the democratic rather than the republican platform in every advance he has made. It has been a great embarrassment to him that the platform upon which he was elected was filled with praises of the republican party's record rather than with promises of reform; even the enthusiastic support given him by the democrats has enabled the champions of the trusts to taunt him with following democratic leadership. He has probably gone as far as he could go without incurring the hostility of the leaders of his own party. The trouble is that the republican party is not in a position to apply effective and thorough-going reforms, because it has built up through special legislation the very abuses which need to be eradicated.

"Before any intelligent action can be taken against the trusts we must have a definition of a trust. Because no corporation has an absolute and complete monopoly of any important product, the apologists for the trusts sometimes insist that there are in reality no trusts. Others insist that it is impossible to legislate against such trusts that may exist without doing injury to legitimate business. For the purposes of this discussion it is sufficient to draw the line at the point where competition ceases to be effective and to designate as a trust any corporation which controls so much of the product of any article that it can fix the terms and conditions of sale.

"Legislation which prevents monopoly not only does not injure legitimate business, but actually protects legitimate business from injury. We are indebted to the younger Rockefeller for an illustration which makes this distinction clear. In defending the trust system he is quoted as saying that as the American beauty rose can not be brought to perfection without pinching off ninety-nine buds, so that the one hundredth bud can receive the full strength of the bush, so great industrial organizations are impossible without the elimination of the smaller ones. It is a cruel illustration but it presents a perfectly accurate picture of trust methods. The democratic party champions the cause of the ninety-nine enterprises which are menaced; they must not be sacrificed that one great combination may flourish and when the subject is understood we shall receive the cordial support of hundreds of thousands of business men who have themselves felt the oppression of the trusts or who, having observed the effect of the trusts upon others, realize that their safety lies, not in futile attempts at the restraint of trusts, but in legislation which will make a private monopoly impossible.

"There must be no mistaking of the issue and no confusing of the line of battle. The trust, as an institution, will have few open defenders. The policy of the trust defenders will be to insist upon 'reasonable regulation' and then they will rely upon their power to corrupt legislatures and to intimidate executives to prevent the application of any remedies which will interfere with the trusts. Our motto must be: 'A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable,' and our plan of attack must contemplate the total and complete overthrow of the monopoly principle in industry. We need not quarrel over remedies. We must show ourselves willing to support any remedy and every remedy which promises substantial advantage to the people in their warfare against monopoly. Something is to be expected from the enforcement of the criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law, but this law must be enforced not against a few trusts as at present, but against all trusts, and the aim must be to imprison the guilty, not merely to recover a fine. What is a fine of a thousand dollars or even ten thousand dollars to a trust which makes a hundred thousand dollars while the trial is in progress?

"If the criminal clause is not going to be enforced it ought to be repealed. If imprisonment is too severe a punishment for the eminently respectable gentlemen who rob eighty millions of people of hundreds of millions of dollars annually, the language of the statute ought to be changed, for nothing is more calculated to breed anarchy than the failure to enforce the law against rich criminals while it is rigidly enforced against petty offenders. But it is not sufficient to enforce ex-