

the wealthy" and declares that the railroads "want to be sure that for some simple and perhaps innocent infraction of a complicated law they can not be mulcted for millions." It attacks the courts and the judge who imposed the \$29,000,000 fine for "a technical violation of the law." It calls these and other decisions "outrageous" and says they were "formed by a socialistic public sentiment and carried out in the name of law, etc., etc."

Was the editoria, written for the Pennsylvania railroad or did the Pennsylvania railroad just happen to stumble on to the editorial? Who owns Leslie's Weekly? Is it not worth while for the reader to find out who stands behind these magazines that assault the government, the congress and the legislature? Whose knife is it that is stabbing out of the dark? What conscience, what character, what reputation stands back of the editorial in Leslie's Weekly? If we knew the controlling force we could better weigh the words and the above is only a sample of what is now going on in this country.

The press that ought to be the avenue through which information reaches the public has in many cases become the vehicle for the spread of misinformation and for veiled attacks upon those who would enact legislation just to the masses.



TOBACCO TRUST TOO?

The New York World, so fond of asking irrelevant questions, may be interested in a recent issue of the publication called "Tobacco" and published in the interest of the tobacco trade. The editor of "Tobacco" charges that the New York World has deliberately ignored important news, the publication of which was not desired by the tobacco trust magnates. This trade publication then asks:

"Can it be that Joseph Pulitzer is one of the little handful of persons who hold stock in the tobacco trust? Does the owner of the World participate with Duke and Ryan in the dividends of the concern whose methods have recently been characterized by Colonel Henry Watterson in the Louisville Courier-Journal, 'Those of the pirate, the pickpocket and the porch-climber.'"



THE TRAVELING MAN

Have you talked with the traveling men lately? They are an important factor in our commercial progress and they are the best news gatherers. The merchants come into contact with the farmers and laboring men, and the merchants' opinion is communicated to the traveling men in return for information gathered in the business centers. Thus the evangel of commerce becomes a sort of telephone, carrying the messages back and forth and bringing the different sections of the country into communication.

The traveling men know that the public is not satisfied with existing conditions and they know that the voters are becoming aware of the fact that the republican party is responsible for the conditions. Monopoly in trade and in transportation is the enemy of the traveling men because the commercial traveler is the exponent of competition and the deadly foe of monopoly. Monopoly needs few traveling men and the traveling man is retired in proportion as monopoly gains a foothold. Anything that restricts trade or hinders commerce hurts the traveling man, and he is naturally drawn to democratic ideas because democracy stands for the greatest freedom of the individual and of industry. When the democratic party demands that the government shall be administered by the representatives of the people and in behalf of the people, it takes a position which the traveling man is compelled by his interest to endorse, for just in proportion as the masses prosper the traveling man finds business; just in proportion as the producers are embarrassed the commercial traveling man's work is retarded. In proportion as the trusts obtain control of the industries, the business of the traveling man is menaced; in proportion as there is independence in industry, the traveling man thrives. The traveling man is by nature a tariff reformer for while the monopoly may increase its dividends by limiting its product and increasing its price, the traveling man must depend upon large sales, and large sales depend upon fair prices. The more money left in the pockets of the masses, the more they have to spend with the merchants and through the traveling man.

And so with the railroad question. The traveling men have been benefited by the re-

duction in rates, not only directly, but they have been benefited indirectly. The traveling man does not profit by the accumulation of unearned dividends in the hands of a few railroad magnates—he profits as the power of the people to spend increases. The traveling man might be interested in watered stock and fictitious capitalization if he was running a matrimonial bureau and selling foreign titles to American heiresses, but as he is interested in bringing the producer and consumer together he is compelled by force of circumstances to advocate legislation which will make business active and remove restrictions from trade and exchange.

The commercial travelers will be a valuable auxiliary in the coming campaign. They are intelligent, ever present and always on the watch. They do more talking for the amount of pay they receive than any other class of people, and they generally know what they are talking about. If you want to know the trend of affairs, listen to the traveling men as they get together at the close of the day's work. They are a pretty good index of public opinion.



A TEMPORARY INTEREST

Just after the election of 1904 a man who was prominent among the advocates of Mr. Parker's nomination at St. Louis remarked that a great many people who were advocating Mr. Parker's nomination, showed very little interest in the campaign after the nomination. It is true. There are certain financial interests which are always active before the convention; they want to dominate both parties and nominate both candidates. After the convention adjourns, they pick out their candidate and proceed to help elect him, ignoring entirely the other candidate, even if they helped to force him upon the convention. That is just the situation at this time. There are certain monopolistic influences that are demanding that the democrats nominate a man friendly to predatory wealth. These men have their representatives in the various states and they are working underhand. When they talk to a man they say: "Of course, we can not prevent instructions, but we can get the right kind of men on the delegation, and then watch our opportunity." These men are speaking in whispers; they are working underground. If they can control the democratic convention and nominate some one in whom the predatory interests have confidence, they will then feel sure that the democratic party has no chance, and proceed to help the republican candidate.

Can they fool the voters? Not this time. The experience of four years ago has not been forgotten and with that experience fresh in memory, the democrats will put none but the trustworthy on guard. If the democratic voter wants to understand the real purpose of the trust papers, let him compare the eulogies of Judge Parker which appeared before the convention with the denunciations of him that followed. These papers that told what a splendid man he was and how strong the party would be under his leadership turned against him as soon as the campaign opened. The New York World, one of his loudest champions, received money from the republican campaign committee for an advertisement (unless the World published it gratuitously) for space for a scurrilous cartoon the Sunday before election.

The interest of predatory wealth in the democratic party is only temporary. It is manifested just before the convention because it would cost less to defeat the democratic party in the convention than to defeat it at the polls, and the defeat of the democratic party is the only thing which it desires.



THE OLD, OLD STORY

The Boston Herald prints the following timely letter:

Secretary Garfield's recent speech at Columbus, O., contained the following:

"The tariff should be revised in accordance with the republican policy of protection; schedules should be so adjusted as to give to our wage-workers, producers and manufacturers the benefit of the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad. Under schedules so arranged there need be no fear of favors to any monopoly."

Would your readers be interested in the closing portion of another speech by a good republican upon tariff reform?

"In determining when and how that process (of tariff revision) shall be undertaken, two cardinal rules should be observed. First, it should be done only when congress is as free

as possible from the distractions and temptations of an active presidential campaign. The longer the time that is to intervene before an important election, the more free from prejudice will be the consideration, the more pointed will be the discussion, the more sincere will be the treatment, and the more effective will be the action of the representatives of the people upon any question of tariff reform.

"Secondly, if the American people wish the principle of protection to be maintained, then the political party which believes in protection should do the wish of revisers. That party can be safely trusted to do it in due time and with due regard to the best interests of all the people of the United States, farmer and miner and manufacturer, and merchant, employer, wage-earner, producer and consumer alike."

How natural all this sounds, and how familiar! How beautifully adapted to the present time! It might have been delivered yesterday, but it wasn't. It was made by Secretary Root before the Home Market club, April 20, 1903, five years ago, and the "due time" has not yet arrived. Next summer, at the republican convention, the platform will contain an elegant and rhetorically written assurance of the fixed intention of the republican party to revise the tariff, and the writer will be perfectly well aware that the party, if it can have its way, will shut down upon every attempt to fulfill the promise. And a few years hence, when another convention will be coming along, some leading politician will still be telling the innocent public that the tariff must be revised by its friends and that the party can be safely trusted to, etc., etc., etc.—the same old story; and the curious thing is that the innocent public will more than half believe it.

Boston.



MR. BRYAN AND MINNESOTA

The following editorial is taken from the Omaha World-Herald:

"Complaint is made by the enemies of Mr. Bryan, including those alleged democrats who mean to oppose him when he is nominated, because he does not 'permit' Governor Johnson to have the unanimous and unquestioned support of his home state in the Denver convention. It is plausibly asserted that it would be only ordinary fairness and courtesy on Mr. Bryan's part to concede Minnesota to Minnesota's distinguished democratic governor. It is to be hoped that none of Mr. Bryan's friends will be deceived by this sophistry.

"In the first place, neither Mr. Bryan nor any other man is in position to dictate to the democrats of any state whom they must support. All that Mr. Bryan or anybody else is entitled to ask is that if democrats are for him they instruct for him; if they are for somebody else, let them instruct for somebody else. In either case, the rank and file must say for themselves what candidate they want. Mr. Bryan has said that if the democrats of this country want him for their candidate he is ready to serve them. He has made no demands in his own behalf; it would be just as improper for him to issue commands to his friends—and that is what it would amount to—in behalf of somebody else.

"In the second place, the Johnson candidacy in Minnesota is only a part of the plan of Mr. Bryan's enemies. If Mr. Bryan should bring pressure on his friends to concede Minnesota to Governor Johnson because Minnesota is Governor Johnson's state, there would soon be a "favorite son" candidate in most, if not all the states. And the same argument used in Minnesota would be used to bring it about that every state instructed for its own 'favorite son' candidate. This would result in chaos at the Denver convention, out of which the enemies of true and popular democracy might hope to bring their sinister designs into shape and being.

"Mr. Bryan is too well acquainted with the enemy to be caught by any such trap. If the democrats of Minnesota want Johnson let them instruct for him. If they want Bryan let them instruct for Bryan. The question to be considered not alone in Minnesota but in every state is not where a candidate hails from but what he stands for. A candidate's ideals, associations, interests, sincerity, are of far greater moment than his geographical location. It is undoubtedly a realization of this fact that leads many democrats in Minnesota to desire Mr. Bryan's nomination rather than that of Governor Johnson. Under the circumstances it would be an act of poor democracy to seek to induce them to desist from the contest.—Omaha World-Herald.