

## Washington Letter

Washington, D. C., October 21.—The New York World for three or four days has been carrying in practically the same place on its first page a challenge to Mr. Bryan to prove his alleged assertion that "the great metropolitan dailies are controlled by the trusts and the columns are open to the highest bidder." It happened that I was present when the speech to which the World in its supreme virtue takes exception was made. The World's quotation is not accurate. But setting that aside, it seems worth while to consider whether even that expression could not be justified.

Mr. Bryan did draw a line between the great city newspapers and the papers of the smaller cities, and he did say that the latter and the country press were less involved with the great trusts and the stockjobbing corporations than the former. Nobody with any knowledge of the newspaper business will question the justice of this charge.

Newspapers do not have to be in the pay of the trusts to do the dirty work of the trusts. It is easy for them to denounce monopolies and yet persistently and continually oppose any political movement which is seriously intended to put the monopolists out of business. Take for example the New York World which is challenging Mr. Bryan for an answer to its question. The World has done a great deal of agitating against trusts and monopolies. It has in my own judgment accomplished a great deal of good work along that line. It was the first newspaper in New York to show the contribution of life insurance funds to Mark Hanna and to George Cortelyou for the benefit of the republican party. It was two days ago the first paper to reveal the fact that the stockholders and the bondholders of the Metropolitan Traction company had been robbed of part of the earnings of the company in order that it might be given to Mr. Cortelyou, and through him to Mr. Roosevelt.

This is good work for the World to do. But what has it been doing at the same time? When in 1896 all of the people whom it now denounces as trust magnates and monopolists were marching up Broadway, nobody was more enthusiastic in their support than the editors of the New York World. In 1900 the World, which now asks Mr. Bryan to explain why metropolitan newspapers stand for the trusts, did stand for the trusts. In 1904 when a candidate acceptable to the trusts and to the monopolies of New York was nominated, the World for the first time showed some slight signs of interest in the democratic ticket. Today there is no one making so strong a fight, or so vigorous a one against trusts and monopolies as Mr. Bryan himself. And yet day after day the editorial columns of the World and its news columns are given over to denunciation of him.

True, on the first page, Mr. Pulitzer will occasionally print an attack on a trust or a report of the strenuous things that Mr. Hughes or Mr. Roosevelt is doing for their destruction. But his editorial page is given over to the denunciation of the only man who has been made by the trusts their deadliest enemy and who has never wavered in his enmity to them.

The issues of the next campaign are even now quite well defined. Senator James B. Frazier, of Tennessee, who succeeds ex-Senator Carmack, is stopping at the New Willard. In conversation with me, he repeated what any number of prominent democrats have told me in the last few months. He says the next democratic platform will contain three fundamental declarations—first, a plank against executive usurpations and centralization; second, a plank for immediate tariff revision; and third, a definite anti-trust plank. Mr. Bryan months ago practically defined these three issues as paramount. Senator Frazier merely adds his word to those of scores of others to prove that the democracy is united on the great fundamental principles of the present time as it never was before.

Much of what the new Tennessee senator says is worthy of consideration. To quote: "Especially during the present administration the tendency toward centralization has been going on at a very rapid rate. So marked has this tendency become that the question whether local self government shall be preserved is going to be one of the paramount issues of the next campaign. If present tendencies continue, the states will become more geographical divisions of a highly centralized government."

That these views of Senator Frazier are no mere nightmare of a democratic statesman is evidenced by the proposals of the present administration. The plea for a federal incorporation law, the idea to appoint federal receivers for unlawful trusts, the violation of the eleventh amendment to the constitution that is implied in the enjoining of state officials by federal courts, the growth of government by commission, are all striking evidences of this tendency.

Concerning the tariff, Senator Frazier's remarks are equally pertinent. He said: "Another plank in the platform should demand a revision of the tariff, not in the far off, indefinite future, nor by those friends of the present tariff who would practically not revise it at all. The republicans have been promising revision just before election for a long time, but the Dingley schedules go on just the same."

What Senator Frazier says about the tariff needs no comment. But his belief, as expressed to me, that the national platform should be modeled after the recent Nebraska platform, which it is said was drafted by Mr. Bryan, is of great significance.

WILLIS J. ABBOT.

## Letters From the People

William L. Ross, 410 Gaskill street, Philadelphia.—If it took the American nation over thirty years time to set their judicial machinery a going against "the 26 Wall Street gang of representative business men," how long will it take to collect that "\$29,000,000 Landis fine?" If the term "anarchy" means the unrestricted personal will and initiative of the individual, have we not a certain type of anarchists, such as our predatory trust magnates. As fine a collection of real anarchists as ever practiced the social idea. If not, what is their civic standard? There is more such simple practical information needed, but the above may hold your attention for a while if you are not too busy chasing your share of the present "one sided prosperity." If so, then don't worry about your own personal civic business. Leave that to the experts (the politicians) and their employers. They will gladly take care of it for you.

J. E. Pauley, LaFayette, Ind.—Did you read closely President Roosevelt's speech at Indianapolis? Why do I see nowhere comment on the statement that corporation attorneys should not engage in politics. This is not the words but the sentiment, as I remember it as published in the independent News of Indianapolis. Another point, in all the freight rate discussion I see no one suggests that inasmuch as all freight is classified, and broken and carload lot rates are made, why is there not an in and out price, that so much a car or so much a hundred for receiving and loading freight, and so much for discharging or unloading freight. This to be the same regardless of the haul, then let the rate for hauling be so much per mile, or so much for any distance not over fifty or one hundred miles, and so much for additional hundreds or fifties or fractions thereof. Let the shortest line rule between competing points. There should be also uniform transfer fees where a change of roads is necessary.

H. S. Julian, Kansas City, Mo.—I desire to call attention to the provision for the election of United States senators direct by the people. Section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, says: "The senate of the United States shall be composed of two senators from each state, chosen by the legislature thereof, for six years; and each senator shall have one vote." You will notice that the framers used the word "chosen," and not elect, or select. Now my proposition is this, that it could be reached by the state constitution requiring that elections be held by direct vote of the people for the election of United States senators, and then that the legislature of the state when it met be compelled to choose the candidate receiving the highest vote at said election. That in no way would conflict with the federal constitution, but follow it. There have been a number of states, I believe the majority of them, through their legislatures have petitioned the congress of the United States to submit a constitutional amendment to accomplish this end, but the result has been the same that has met the humble petitioners

in Russia for relief from robbery, by appealing to the robber himself to relent. In the future, if the legislature of any state should be persuaded that the present method of selecting United States senators is wrong; that it is productive of bribery and corruption, that it enables a favored few to further their evil designs, and tighten their grip upon special advantages they now hold by law; then it will be simple enough for it to adopt a resolution, submitting a constitutional amendment to the voters of that state directing that at the general election preceding the date of the expiration of the term of a United States senator, that at said election the legal voters of said state shall vote direct for their choice for United States senator, and that when the legislature assembles it shall choose and elect the candidate receiving the highest number of votes at said election. And of course every member of the legislature will be legally bound by his oath, to ratify the selection of the voters of his state. This method would have this in its favor, over an amendment to the federal constitution; that if upon trial, the direct method of selecting senators resulted in a better and stronger set of men being sent to the United States senate than was sent by the legislatures electing them, then by the laws of evolution (survival of the fittest) the direct system of election would be adopted in all the states. If on the other hand it proved erroneous, and a weaker and less able set of men were selected by direct vote than by the legislative method, then the state constitutional provision could be repealed, and resort be had to the present method.

## The New Issue

The following editorial under the title "The New States Rights Issue" is taken from the New York Evening Post:

It was nearly twenty years ago that Mr. Bryce wrote in the American Commonwealth that, while a democrat always admitted frankly, that his cherished doctrine of states' rights had no bearing "on any presently debated issue," he still insisted that "should any issue involving the rights of the states arise, his party will be, as always, the guardian of American freedom." The point is worth recalling, now that this historic tenet of the democratic party is being put forward as a possible major issue next year. There was not a word about states' rights in either of the party platforms of 1904. Can it be that in less than three years the matter has unexpectedly arisen as a factor in party alignment?

That democrats of all schools do take an interest in this issue is indisputable. While Mr. Bryan in Nebraska was drafting a platform demanding that "federal remedies shall be added to and not substituted for state remedies," Judge Parker at Jamestown was asking "by what process of reasoning the executive has reached the conclusion that for the various departments of the federal government to seize power not granted by the states and the people is 'to protect and defend the constitution.'" Even republicans show some concern over the subject. There were more republicans than democrats among the state attorneys general who, in convention this week, asked congress to prevent the interference of the inferior federal courts with the progress of test cases through the state courts. Congressman McCall, who recently called attention to the five-fold increase since 1897 in the sum spent annually for various branches of federal inspection, is likewise a republican, of an "undesirable" sort.

It is unnecessary to recapitulate the acts and measures which have given present meaning to the shibboleths of a past generation. The federal authorities have been doing and talking of doing a great many things which, whether done or neglected in practice, had always been considered among the duties allotted to the states. The reaction was unexpected. Instead of consenting to have their work done for them, the states began to busy themselves. Some state or other now claims to have shown the federal government the way in nearly every one of its late activities. All are making new assertions of purpose and efficiency. From a parcel of anaemic, undecided, futile damsels, the states have come to be regarded as a sisterhood of Valkyries, compared with whom the central government is a kindly grandmother, to whose lap menaced corporations gladly run to be cuddled.

The extension of the field of federal activity has generally proceeded on the theory that a practical people did not care much about