BRYANON TRUST QUESTION

REPUBLICANS ARE INDIFFERENT John Worth Kern, Takes a Fall t of the Opposition Toward the rulng Question of the Hour—He aling Question of the Hour—He ritists the Republican and Dem-tic Platforms on the Subject of its and, Quoting Judge Tart's rances, Criticises Him For the

Attitude He Takes—Nothing to be Expected From the Republican Party in View of the Coloriess Platform Upon Which It Goes Before the People, Indianapolis, Aug. 25 .- Easily the ture of the notification cerem

ere to-day was the speech of Wilwhich it stood before the people. criticised severaly Judge Taft's atterances on the subject of trusts Republican and Democratic platforms. His speech in full follows:

MR. BRYAN'S SPEECH. Nowhere does the Republican party nore than in its treatment of the

lican platform: The Republican party passed the Sherman anti-trust law over Democratic opposition and enforced it afhas shown that its effectiveness can as will give to the Federal governover, and secure greater publicity in, the management of that class of corporations engaged in inter-State commerce, having power and opportunity to affect monopolies."

The Sherman anti-trust law eighteen years ago; it has a who conspire ing two years of the four, it controlled the House of Representatives. Instead of Démocratic dereliction. the Democratic party has been urgforcement of that law, and the Reseriously interrupted. President has done something toward the enforcement of the law, but not the enforcement of the law; nearly enough, and the gress a message which shocked Re-publican leaders by the fierceness of The dation of the predatory in-The very convention

boldly opposed every effort to free favor-seeking corporations.

tration as "a wise and fearless one."

TAFT'S SPEECH WEAK. The Republican platform says that experience has shown that the effectiveness of the anti-trust law competing corporations, it is not nec could be strengthened by amendments which will give the Federal an agreement for the restraint control over, and greater publicity out violating the law, reach the same as to, the management of those inter-State commerce corporations nity to affect monopolies. outlining of a plan for more effect. As stated in the platform it is: legislation—simply a general platform. eral years, been the intimate official companion of the President, but he has caught none of the mes-the President manifested in his mescaught none of the fire which sage of last January.

If in the presence of an aroused ople, and in the heat of a campaign, the Republican party In his speech delivered about a regulate interstate commerce. year ago announcing his candidacy Mr. Taft suggested that the present law be so smended as to permit "reasonable" restraint of trade. against burglary limiting the law cases in which more than two bur-glars entered the house at one time or took more than half they found. national incorporation-a remedy because, without adding to the powpower to protect their own peo-

CONTRASTS THE PLATFORMS. Now, let me contrast the Demeplatform with the Republican m. Nowhere is the difference in the temper of the parties more no-ticeable; nowhere is the difference in the same. he method of dealing with questions more manifest. Our platform says: criminal law against guilty trust tion to the following words: es and officials, and demand fy three; First, a law prevent- members or agents."

in which it deats, the incease to protect the public from watered stock and to prohibit the control by such corporation of more than fifty percent of the total amount of any product consumed in the United States; and, third, a law compelling such licensed corporations to sell to all purchasers in all parts of the country of the search terms after making due on the same terms, after making due allowance for cost of transportation."

Here is a plain, candid statement of the party's position. There is no quibbling, no evasion, no ambiguity. A private monopoly is indefensible and intolemble. It is bad—bad in principle, and bad in practice. No apology can be offered for it, and no nere to-day was the property of trusts. Mr. Bryan attacked the apology can be offered for it, and no apology can be offered for it, and no apology can be offered for it, and no apology can be offered for it. Our party's people should endure it. Our party's position is entirely in harmony with the position of Jefferson. With a the position of Jefferson. With a the position of human nature which few men have equaled and none surpassed, and with extraordinary fore sight, he expressed unalterable oppoand contrasted with telling effect the sition to every form of private mo-nopoly. The student of history will find that upon this subject, as upon other subjects of government, great founder of the Democratic party took his position upon the show its indifference to real reform of the whole people and against those who seek to make a private use of trust question. Here is the Repub- government, or strive to secure special privileges at the expense of the public. I have, in discussing the

question, presented one of our remeer Democratic dereliction. It has dies, namely, the removal of the tarbeen a wholesome instrument for iff from imports which compete with good in the hands of a wise and fear-trust made goods. This, we believe, iff from imports which compete with ess administration. But experience would greatly lessen the extrotion practiced by the trusts and bring se strengthened and its real objects about the dissolution of many mobetter attained by such amendments nopolistic combines. But we are not satisfied merely with the lessening of ment greater supervision and control extortion or with the dissolution of some of the trusts.

MONOPOLY EXTERMINATION. Because the private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable, the Democratic party favors its extermination. It pledges itself to the vigcriminal clause which provides a crous enforcement of the criminal penitentiary punishment for those law against trust magnates and offlaw against trust magnates and offitogether in restraint clais. It is impossible for the Reof trade. Ever since the enactment publican party to enforce the presof the law, with the exception of ent criminal law against trust off-four years, the Republican party cials; these officials are intimately controlled the executive depart- connected with the Republican party ment of the government, and, dur- in the present campaign. Take, for instance, the chairman of the publican speaker's committee, Dupont, of Delaware. He is the defendant in a suit which the governing, year after year, the strict en- ment brought and is now prosecuting. Mr. Dupont is charged publican party has been explaining tion of the anti-trust law. Why year after year why it was impossible to enforce it. Instead of being committee and then be given control "wholesome instrument for good." of the speaking part of the camhas been almost useless, so far as paign? If you talk to a Republican the protection of the public is con- leader about penitentiary punishment cerned, for the trusts have grown in for offenders, he favors fining the in strength, and in arro- corporation on the ground that it is mance, at the very time when the impossible to convict individuals, but Republican party was boasting of its when you urge fines you are told that enforcement of the law. The steel fines are unjust to innocent stock-trust was formed immediately af-holders. We favor-both fine and imfer the election of 1900, and a promi- prisonment, but we think it is betnent Republican said, in a speech ter to prevent monopolles than to soon after, that it might have prevented a Republican victory if it had been formed before the election. The public and then try to punish them for doing so. Mr. Taft favors Most of the trusts have never been control of trusts instead of extermidisturbed, and these that have been nation, but after years of experience prosecuted have not had their busi- the people have learned that the The trusts control the government.

Our platform does not stop with Republican mands the enactment of such addileaders have thwarted him at every tional legislation as may be necessary point. Finally the President became to make it impossible for a private so exasperated that he sent to Con- monopoly to exist in the United

The Democratic party does not ontent itself with a definition of the that wrong or with a denunciation of it. spoke in its platform of the adminis-It proceeds to outline remedies. The first is a law preventing a duplication was composed largely of the Sena-tors and members of Congress who porations. No one can object to this remedy unless he is in sympathy with the people from the clutches of the the trusts, rather than with the people who are victimized by the trusts. There is no easier way of stifling competition than to make one board of directors serve for a number of essary for corporations to enter into government greater supervision and trade if the corporations can, with-

The second remery is one upon which have the power and opportu- which I desire to dwell at some That is length. We believe it to be a simple. No pointing out of remedies; no complete and easily enforced remedy

statement that promises nothing in abridging the right of each State to particular. And Mr. Tatt's speech of create corporations, or its right to He gives no evidence of tions doing business within its limits. having studied the question or of make it necessary for a manufactur-comprehending the inquities of a ing or trading corporation engaged monopoly. You look in vain in his in interstate commerce to take out a findignation at what the trusts have been doing or for evidence of zeal in their prosecution. He has for sevil five percent, of the product in which it deals, the license to protect the public from watered stock and to prohibit the control by such corporation of more than fifty per cent. of the total amount of any product consumed in the United States."

STATES RIGHTS PRESEREVD. It will be noticed, in the first place, itself with a colorless platform that care was taken by those who on this subject, what can we expect drew the platform to provide that in the way of activity when the exi- there should be no abridgment of gencies of the campaign are passed? the right of a State to create corpora- ation to attempt to destroy a competi-If, when Mr. Taft is appealing to tions, or of its right to regulate as the Roosevelt Republicans, his dis- it will foreign corporations doing cussion of the subject is so lifeless business within its limits. This plan, and at an exorbitant price where it and his manner so apologetic and therefore, does not in the least inwhat reason have we to fringe upon the right of the States expect either vigor in the enforce- to protect their own people. It simment of the law or earnestness in ply provides for the exercise by Conthe search for additional remedies? gress of the power vested in it to ong as a corporation confines itself to the State in which it is created, ongress cannot interfere with it: but when the corporation engages in Buch an amendment would be as ab. interstate commerce, Congress is the surd as an amendment to the law only power that can regulate its into terstate business.

In proposing the exercise of this power, the Democratic platform is not asserting a new doctrine. In In In his notification sueech he suggests January, 1896, a Republican House of Representatives adopted a resoluwhich would make conditions worse tion calling upon Hon. Judson Harof Congress to prevent monopo-the States, now the Democratic hes, it would deprive the States of candidate for Governor in Ohio, to report what steps, if any, had been taken to enforce the law of United States against trusts, combinations and conspiracies in restraint of trade and commerce, and what further legislation was, in his opinion needed to protect the people against On the \$th day of Feb. ruary he submitted a reply, in which he described the steps which were private monopoly is indefens, being taken to enforce the law, and infolerable. We therefore recommended the enactment of being taken to enforce the law, and vigorous enforcement of ther legislation. I call special atten-

"Congress may make it unlawful actment of such additional to ship from one State to another, in some as may be necessary to sarrying out, or attempting to carry to exist in the United States, sanizations, articles produced, owned the additional remedies, we or controlled by them or any of their members or agents."

His recommendation embodies the

tions doing business within its limits, of a monopolistic purpose. Surely make it necessary for a manufacturing or trading corporation engaged opposed to private monopolies which in inter-State commerce to take out will permit the interstate railroads a Federal license before it shall be to be used to carry out the designs permitted to control as much as of a monopoly, or which will permit twenty-five per cent, of the product the interstate telegraph lines to be in which it deals, the license to proused to increase the power of a pri-vate monopoly; or, to make the case stronger, no party can consistently claim to be opposed to the trusts which will allow the mails of the United States to be used by the trusts as an agency for the extermination of competition. Congress has already exercised this power to exterminate lettered. lotteries. Why not exercise it to make private monopolies impossible? If it is conceded that Congress has the power to prevent the shipment of goods from one State to anothe when such shipment is a part of a conspiracy against trade and commerce then the only question is as to the means to be employed to prevent such shipment. The license tem presents an easy way of regulating such corporations as need Federal regulation. The law can prohibit the doing of a thing and impose penalty for the violation of law, but experience has shown that it is very difficult to gather up dence from all sections of the United States and prosecute a great corporation, so difficult is it, that although the Sherman anti-trust law has been in force for eighteen years; no trust magnate has been sent to the penitentlary for violating the law, although in a few cases the court has found corporations guilty of a violation of the law. In the enforcement of a penalty, the government must seek the defendant; by the use of the li-

cense system, the corporation is compelled to seek the government. DEFINITION OF A TRUST. A trust can best be defined as a corporation which controls so large a proportion of the total quantity of any article used in this country as to be able to regulate the price and terms of sale, and as the proportion controlled determines the power of the trust for harm, it has seemed best to use proportionate control as the basis of this plan, and twenty-five per cent has been fixed arbitrarily as the proportion at which the line should be drawn. A comporation which con-trols less than 25 per cent of the product in which it deals, may, in extraordinary cases, exert 'a perceptible influence in controlling the price of the product and the terms of sale, but as a rule a corporation must control more than that percentage of the total product before it can exert a harmful influence on trade. Under this plan, the small corporations are left entirely free and unhampered. This is not a discrimination against the larger corporation, but a recognition of the fact that rules are necessary in the case of corporations controlling a large percentage of the product which are not necessary in the case of smaller corporations. Probably not one per cent of the corporations engaged in interstate commerce would be required to take out a license under this plan-possibly not one-half of one per cent-and yet vitat a protection the remaining nine ty-nine per cent would find in the law requiring a license in the case of the larger ones! pear which outwelgh any good that can come from larger production or

The license, however, would not prevent the growth of the corporations licensed. It would simply bring them under the eye of the Federal government and compel them to deal with the public in such a way as to afford the public the protection necessary. One of the restrictions sug gested is that such licensed corporations be compelled to sell to all purchasers in all parts of the country it can be shown that in order to drive out competition, a corporation owning a large part of the plant producing an article is selling in one part of the a low and unprofitable price, and in another part of the country where it has none, at an exorbitant price, this is evidence that it is attempting an unlawful monopoly and justifies conviction under the anti-trust law."

If such an act is now unlawful, why very protection? The trouble with the plan proposed in the Democratic platform brings the corporation under the surveillance of the government when it has reached the danger point, and thereafter subjects it to Federal scrutiny. The present law simply prohib its it in an indefinite sort of a way and then leaves the officers of the law to scour the country and hunt up viola tions of the law's provisions. Mr. Taft is unduly alarmed at this proposal, or else he entirely fails to comprehend the details of the plan. He says:

"To supervise the business of corperations in such a way as to fix the price of commodities and compel the sale at such a price as as absurd and socialistic a plank as was ever inserted in Democratic political plat-

DEMOCRATS MORE SOCIALISTIC And yet this sentence is found in the same paragraph with the sentence above quoted in which he declares that it is even now a violation of the Sherman anti-trust law for a corportor by selling at a low and unprofitahas no competition. In what respec is our plan more socialistic than the plan which Mr. Taft endorses? Merely in the fact that ours can be enforc-According to Mr. Taft's logic, a plan is not socialistic which is not effective, but the same would be socialistic if made effective. Why should a corporation supplying twenty-five million people—for a corporation controlling twenty-five per cent of the total product supplies one-fourth. more, of our population-should such a corporation be permitted to sell at one price in one part of the country and at another price in another part? What reason can a corporation have for such discrimination? Prices are not made as a matter of favor; when a big corporation sells to the people of one section at one price and the people of another section at another price-the cost of transportation being taken into consideration—there is a reason for it, and in almost every case the reason is to be found in the effort to destroy a competitor. the most familiar methods of the trust is to undersell a small competitor in the small competitor's territory-the price being maintained elsewhere— until the small competitor is driven to bankruptcy and then the price is raised. That has been done over and over again. It is open and notorious. And yet with the Republican party in com power in Washington, what fort has been made to prevent this! This remedy, although vehemently denounced by Mr. Taft, will appeal to

utary, but very unnecessary, Fifty per cent is fixed as the maxiting corporations; second, a very idea which our plan now prosystem which will, without poses to carry out. We want to make it unlawful for a corporation duct, it supplies forty millions of peocorporations, or its right to to use the instrumentalities of interits as it will foreign corporastate commerce for the carrying out enough? Mr. Taft's objection to this

the average man as not only very sal-

nitation can hardly be character-MR. TAFT'S OBJECTION.

"A corporation controlling fortyfive or fifty per cent of the product,
may by well known methods, frequently effect a monopoly and stamp
out competition in a part of a country
as completely as if it controlled sixty or seventy per cent thereof."

Way, then, does he not propose a
lower limit? If the control of fortyfive per cent may constitute a monopoly, why does he not suggest that as
a maximum? It cannot be because
of any disinclination to amend his of any disinclination to amend his platform, for he has already made a patchwork quilt of the convention's platform by promiscuous amend-

ments. And to what "well known" methods does he refer? To the underselling of competitors / in one section while the price is maintained elsewhere? And yet this is the very thing which we propose to remedy, but he proceeds to denounce our remedy as absurd and socialistic. The trouble with Secretary Tatt is that he spends so much time trying to discover ex-cuses for inaction in trust matters that he has none left for the consideration of effective remedies. He spends more time uttering warnings against remedies proposed than he does in pointing out the evils to be remedied or in suggesting remedies. He says:

"The combination of capital in large lants to manufacture goods with the greatest economy is just as necessary as the assembling of the parts of a machine to the economical and more rapid manufacture of what in old times was made by hand."
And he adds that:

"The government should not interfere with any one more than the other, when such aggregations of capital are legitimate and are properly controlled, for they are the natural results of modern enterprise and are beneficial to the public.

No one proposes to interfere with production on a large scale. No one objects to production on a scale suf-ficiently large to enable the producer to utilize by-products and take ad-vantage of all the economies that large production makes possible. is just here that the trust magnates attempt to confuse the public mind, and Mr. Taft has unconsciously adopted their language.

THE ISSUE MADE PLAIN, Let the issue be made plain; let the distinction be accurately drawn; let the respective positions of the parties be fully understood. The Democratic party does not oppose all corpora-tions; on the contrary, it recognizes that the corporation can render an mportant service to the public. important service to the public. The Democratic party wants to employ every instrumentality that can be employed for the advancement of the common good; but the Democratic party draws the line at private mo nopoly, and declares that a private monopoly can not be justified on eith er economic or political grounds.

monopoly is objectionable. The mo ment a corporation secures a practical monopoly in the production or sale of any article, certain evils apcontrol. Wherever private monopo-lies exist, certain irresistible tendencles manifest themselves First, it raises prices—this is the first thing thought of for the increasing or profits Then, in proportion as it becomes the it reduces the price of the raw ma-terial, and the producer of that raw material, having no other market, must accept the price offered. this way, too, the profits of the coron the same terms, after making due poration are increased. Third, a re-allowance for cost of transportation. duction in the quality of the product follows wherever conditions will permit.

Competition protects the purchaser for when a number of independent country, where it has competitors, at producers stand ready to supply him with what he needs, he can choose tween them and buy from the one product at who offers the best lowest price. He is also protected in quality because those who compete for the opportunity to sell to him must show either advantage in price If such an act is now unlawful, why or advantage in quality. Competi-is he so frightened at a plan which tion protects the man who produces gives to the small competitor this raw material, for when there are a number of bidders for that which present law is that it does not restrain being sold, he can accept the highest the evils at which it is aimed. The price offered. Competition also helps the wage-earner, for his skill is the finished preduct which he offers upon the market, and where a number of independent industries are endeavoring to secure the highest skill, the skilled laborer has the best assurance of obtaining a fair recompense; when there is but one employer, the em ploye must take the price offered be cause he will lose the advantage of his experience if he must go out to find a different kind of employment. BUSINESS FEELS PRESSURE.

The business men of the country have felt the pressure of the trusts The retailer has been compelled to enter into contracts which restrict his management of his own affairs, he has found the terms of sale and payment changed to his disadvantage and he has been forced to carry more more of the risks of trade. He is convinced that there, are no good trusts and that his only safety the democratic plan which lays the axe at the root of the tree.

The traveling men naturally take an interest in the trust question, be-cause the more complete the monopoly secured by a corporation the less they are needed. We have no more intelligent class than the representa-tives of commerce, and their retire-ment from the road would mean a serious less to the country while a few promoters would be the only persons benefited, they gaining by the capi-talization of the salaries saved by the elimination of competition. Mr. Taft either misunderstands or

misrepresents the Democratic position in regard to the extermination of the principle of private monopoly. his notificaation speech, he says: "Mr. Roosevelt would compel the trusts to conduct their business in a lawful manner and secure the bene their operation and maintefits of their operation and the manite of which they are an important part

while Mr. Bryan would extirpate and destroy the entire business in order to stamp out the evils which they have practiced." Here is a confession by Mr. Taft that he regards the trusts as necessary to the nation's prosperity, for he declares that they play an important part in the maintenance of prosperity, and he charges that I would pate and destroy" business in extir-pating and destroying the principle of private monopoly. Surely, his study of the trust question has been very superficial if he sees danger in the restoration of a reign of compe-

PARTY POLICY ILLUSTRATED Let us take an illustration: Suppose the Democrats succeed in the enact-ment of a law in harmony with the Democratic platform—a law requiring every corporation to take out a federal license before it is permitted to control 25 per cent. of the business in which it is engaged. Would this "extirpate and destroy" the business of the country? ness of the country? As already stated, but a very small per cent. of the corporations would be affected by the law, and those affected would be the ones that have been giving the

t. to 50 pelled to make such reports as the government required, would be prohibited from watering its stock, and would be required to sell to all customers upon the same terms, due allowance being made for cost of transportation. Would it "extirpate and destroy business to require these licensed corporations to do business on an honest basis and to be reasonable in their business methods? Would not the benefit accruing to the ninety-nine small corporations thus protected from constienceless methods be enough to offset any evil effects that might follow from such restraint of a few big corporations? Is business so dependent upon dishonesty and unfairness that it would be "extirpated and destroyed" if morals were introduced into ft? When the licested corporation reached a point licested corporation reached a point where it controlled one-half of the business in which it was engaged, it would, according to the Democratic plan, have to stop expanding. Would it "extirpate and destroy" business to put this limitation upon the greed of a few corporations? Surely our plan could not injuriously affect cor-porations that might hereafter seek to establish a monopoly.

But possibly Mr. Taft thinks that

it would "extirpate and destroy" business to apply the plan to existing

monopolies. Let us see: Suppose we have a corporation now controlling have a corporation now controlling 75 per cent. of the output of the article in which it deals, and through this control, regulating the price and the terms of sale. How would the Democratic plan affect it? A date would be fixed at which the law would take effect, and on or before that date the corporation would be that date the corporation would be required to apply for a lincense. The evidence would show that it controlled a larger proportion of the product than the law permitted, and it would be compelled to sell off enough of its plants to reduce its output to fifty per cent. of the total product. It could then comply with the law, obtain its license, and proceed to carry on its business in accordance with the law. Would it "extirpate and destroy" business to compel such a corporation to dispose of enough of its plants to reduce its production to 50 per cent? The people would still need the article which it produced. and the plants which it was compelled to sell would become independent plants competing with it. This competition would reduce prices, and the reduced prices would increase the mand for the article, and this creased demand would stimulate building of more factories and a larger employment to labor. restoration of competition in that industry, instead of "extirpating and destroying" the industry would revive and enlarge it. A part of the benefit would go to the consumers in the form of a cheaper product and a better product, part would go to the pro-ducer of raw material in the form of a better price, and part would go to the wage earners in the form of better wages. The only persons to lose would be the trust magnates, who would no longer be able to collect dividends on watered stock by controiling the market. When the subject is analyzed it will be seen that

morals into business would "extirpate and destroy" business. , TAFT'S POSITION ABSURD. I have quoted and re-quoted Mr. Taft's language because I want to impress upon the minds of those who listen to me the absurdity of the objection which he raises to the Demo-cratic plan of exterminating monopolies. He fails to distinguish between Mr. Taft attacks this restriction as affords an opportunity for increasing the honest business that makes a "utterly impracticable." He says: "If profits. Fourth, reduction in wages country prosperous, and the brigandage practiced by private monopolles. The people have been robbed by the trusts to the extent of hundreds of millions a year, and if Mr Taft is not yet conscious of what is going and not yet aroused to the iniquity of these trusts, how can the countr hope for relief through his election? party which is seeking to restore com-Mr. Taft has, in the discus

Mr. Taft must either be in darkness as to the remedy and its effect, or he

must argue that the introduction of

The Democratic party is the defender of competition and the only great sion of this question, employed harsh words instead of argument. The word "socialistic" is hurled at the Democratic party and the Democratic platform. Now, as a matter of fact, it is Mr. Taft's party and not the Democratic party which has given encouragement to socialism. While procouragement to socialism. While professing to abhor socialism, the Republican party has gone half way tovard socialism in endersing its fun damental principle. The socialist bases his contention on the theory that competition is bad, and that an economic advance is to be found in The socialist, however monopoly. wants the public to have the benefit of the monopoly and, therefor vors government ownership and operation of all the means of production and distribution.

The Republican party has gone al-most as far as the Socialist party in the economic defense of the monopo-ly, but it permits the benefits of mo-nopoly to be enjoyed by a compara-tively few men, who have secured a dominant influence in the govern-ment. I beg to call Mr. Taft's attention to the fact that the Republican party has stimulated the growth of socialism in two ways: First, by the endorsement that it has given to the theory that trusts are a natural and necessary outgrowth of our economic conditions, and second, by permitting the development of abuses have been charged against individual-iam. If he will examine the vote published in the World Almanac, he will find that in 1900 the Republicans polled 7,208,344 votes and that the Socialists polled but 85,991; in the same almanac, he will find that in 1904 the Republicans cast 7,625,489 votes and the Socialists 402,286. Not-withstanding the fact that the Republicans have boasted of their last na-tional victory, their party polled but 417,000 more votes that year than four years before. This scarcely more than covered the natural increase in the Republican portion the population, while the Socialist vote increased more than 300 per cent, and the increase in votes was almost as great as the increase Republican votes.

REPUBLICANS AND SOCIALITM. The Republican leaders have been in the habit of sneering at the So-cialists, while blindly indifferent to the causes that have contributed to the growth of socialism. The Demo ocrats recognize that Socialists are honestly seeking a remedy for the "known abuses" admitted by Secretary Taft. Democrats dissent from the remedy proposed by the Socialists, believing that Socialists are mistaken and that the Democratic remedy is belter, but it is time for throughtwal better, but it is time for throughtwul people to recognize that individualism can only be retained and defended by remedial legislation which will remove the abuses which have been allowed to fasten themselves upon to country. The Democratic party, believing in individualism, addresse itself earnestly to these abuses, and instead of ridiculing and maligning to Socialists, invites them, as it does Republicans, to examine the Democratic platform and the remedies proposed therein. It submits its plans to the honest chisenship of the country, without regard to section or party.

In my notification speech I called government shall be taken out of the hands of special interests, and restored to the people as a whole; it asks, second, for honesty in elections and publicity in regard to campaign funds, that the people may freely choose representatives in sympathy with them and pledged to guard their interests; it asks, third, for such a modification of our governmental methods as will make the Senate as elective body, and place the control of the House of Representatives in the hands of a majority of its members. A few days ago, in discussing the tariff question, I dwelt upon the fourth demand made by our party, namely, that taxation be just, that the revenue laws be made for the purpose of raising revenue, and not for the enrichment of a few at the expense of the many, and that the tariff law be supplemented by an impose tax which will more nearly equalize the government's burdens. To-day I present another demand made in our party platform—the demand that the grip of the trusts be broken, that competition be restored and that the door of opportunity be dpened to the business men and the tollers of the land.

AS TO INDEPENDENCE.

AS TO INDEPENDENCE. Industrial independence is neces-sary to political independence. The free exercise of the rights of citizen-ship is impossible when a few men control the industdles in which mil-lions are employed. God forbid that we should compel the wage-earners we should compel the wage-earners of the nation to address their petitions to trust magnates, and ask for their daily bread. Aiready we have seen how prone the monopolist is to make employment depend upon the willingness of the employe to prostitute his ballot to the service of his corporate master.

This question should be settled now; we cannot afford to bequeath it as a legacy of woe to a succeeding generation. The conscience of the people is aiready awakened, and the conscience is the most potent force of which man has knowledge. Where law makes one righteous, conscience

law makes one righteaus, conscience controls an hundred; where one is kept from wrong-doing by fear of prison doors, a thousand are restrained by those invisible walls which con science rears about us barriers which are stronger than walls of granite. It is upon the conscience that human institutions rest, and without a stirring of the conscience no great reform is possible. To a national conscience already aroused we appeal, with the pledge that Democratic victory will mean the ringing out of industrial despotism and the ringing in of a new era in which business will be built upon its merits, and in which men will succeed, not in proportion to the coercion they may be able to practice in proportion to their industry, ability and their fidelity.

BOTH RELY MAINLY ON PRESS Only Newspapers Can Place Cause Before the People—Press Agents to the Fore. Washington Correspondence Balti-

more News. In the absence of campaign funds the managers of campaigns for both political parties are planning to make the newspapers do their work for

them.

To an extent never before, known the press agent will be the real cam paigner this year. The press agent costs less than the campaign orator and gets a vastly bigger audience. Moreover, there is general belief that he is rather a more effective agency for this campaign. There is doubt whether the people care to go to political meetings; there is no doubt whatever that they are reading more about public affairs than ever

How potent the newspapers have become in public affairs since the campaign in 1896 may be judged from the statement that newspaper circulations in this country have more than doubled in that period, while magazine circulations have had an even greater increase. With that, the amount of matter printed per newspaper or magazine is vastly greater than it used to be. Rural free delivery and other conditions have brought the increased circulation; type-setting machines and business prosperity have made it possible to make bigger and better papers. Altogether, the press reaches the public as it never

The newspapers don't require fees for giving political matter to the pub-Bryan worked long and hard in the effort to cut his acceptance speech to phosphorous in the manufacture of such short compass that all the pathe effort. Mr. Taft's speech, try as phorous has been used. he would, was too long for a vast number of papers and had to be subjected to the unsatisfactory process of editorial blue-penciling. It costs an immense amount of

money to get literature to the people by process of making and mailing documents, and when they are thus sent out they don't get so good attention as if printed in the newspapers. The newspaper, in short, is the medium. How to make , "our stuff" look like "news;" how to induce the cold-hearted editor to "use the stuff," is the problem of this campaign. So the national committees are calling into service a great number of

trained and experienced newspaper men. The head of the Republican erary bureau is a newspaper man, and he is surrounded by a corps of craft. Henry Watterson has placed in general charge of the like work for the Democrats. The chairman of the Democratic national committee is a newspaper

publisher, while the executive corps of the Republican committee is composed of working newspaper men to such an extent that it has something akin to a joke. It is pointed out in this cinnection that Mr. Bryan is an editor and publisher, spent some years as an employed editorial writer, while Mr. Taft began life as a reporter on a Cincinnati daily. This use of newspapers in the cam

paign will cause an unusual demand for the really "big men" on the stump and a corresponding diminution in the demand for men of minor calibre. Governor Hughes' address at the Republican national compaign opening at Youngstown will get an immens circulation with practically no expense to the national committee. It 4th, will be provided to the newspapers. and because the Governor is a enough man to make his emanation news it will get printed. To give the same speech anything like the same circulation through other channels would cost an immense amount of money. It has been said that it costs \$200,000 to place a single piece of lit-erature in the hands of all the voters in the country after the article is printed and the mailing lists are obprinted and the mailing lists are tained. For 15,000,000 addresses postage at one cent would be \$150,000.

Because they save this postage ex-pense, which is a cruel and inevitable pense, which is a cruel and inevitable exaction on the campaign trensuries, the speeches of members of Congress are most useful. It does not seem to be generally known, but it is a fact, that the government furnishes only free postage on these speeches—that is, when they are "extracts from the Congressional Record." The Governore he had filled the order copies of it—and he paid no paid lither; his frank carried the

The man who gets his speech print-ed, anyhow, has to pay for it. This year, it is promised, they will all pay alike, which is a real advance.

THE "GUARANTY LAWS."

t Status of the Kansas and Okiahoma Move Bank Deposits.

Topeka Correspondence New York Evening Post The growth of the bank guaranty law idea in the West is evidenced by the proposition to incorporate that plank in the Republican State platform next week, with the probability that it will be adopted. Mr. Bryan will be here two days later to make an address on the same subject, and it is likely that the Republicans will try to forestall him. Reports from Oklahoma say that the action of the comptroller in refusing the national banks permission to join the guaranty under any subterfuge has caused much uneasiness among banks where rivalry exists with State banks that The growth of the bank guaranty rivalry exists with State banks that are "guaranteed," and this, despite the fact that many of the State bankers are personally opposed to

That it has, however, helped the State bank deposits somewhat is admitted, and it is an idea that is growing in the West more as a political expedient than as a sound business procedure. An instance is given of an Oklahoma bank, who was burned recently, in which several merchants of the town kep their balances in currency and gold in deposit boxes rather than place them in open accounts, and this re-gardless of the guaranty law. This was exceptional, but shows the timidity of some parts of the West regarding banks since last fall's flurry.

The interior banks have little to complain of concerning the return of deposits, but there is a constant worry lest a sudden movement to withdraw deposits shall cripple operations, and it is to prevent this that the guaranty law meets favor with many. Three modifications of the Okiahoma law are demanded: Limit of the assessments; no double security for State deposits; no guaranty on interest-bearing deposits. The modification of the law is opposed by the State administration, and it has become a campaign

NO MORE PHOSSY JAW.

White Phosphorous in Match Magu-facture to Be Prohibited. London Daily Chronicle.

After many years of agitation the use of the deadly white phosphorous in the manufacture of matches is soon to be prehibited. A bill backed by Herbert Gladstone and Herbert Samuel with this object in view was introduced in the House of Commons last week, and fuller details of the measure, which was issued from the printers on Saturday, will give satisfaction to the thousands of people employed in this dangerous tade.

The government's action is the indirect result of the Berne labor confedence of September, 1906, when representatives of France, Germany, Italy, Holland, Denmark and Switzerland consented to the prohibition. Britain than agreement. As the outcome of a consultation with the manufacturers the promoters of the bill now before Parliament have made it possible for less dangerous substitutes for white phosphorous which are protected by patents to be obtained on reasonable terms by all manufacturers:

The use of the poisonous white phosphorous is not necessary in the business of match-making. ployment, moreover, is highly dangerous to the workpeople, for it gives rise to the painful disease of nercrosis of the jaw, commonly known as "phossy jaw." This disease has much the same effect on those attacked by it as that of leprosy, and it works the same horrible ravages on the face and hands.

The bill, if it passes into law, will not only forbid the use of white matches but will also make it illegal pers would be able to reproduce it for any one to sell or import matches complete. He got excellent returns for in the making of which white pho-

Democratic Appointments.

The following gentlemen will address the people on the issues of the campaign at the times and places stated: HON. W. W. KITCHIN.

Dobson, Tuesday, September 1st. Sparta, Wednesday, September 2d. Jefferson, Thursday, September 3d. Boone, Friday, September 4th. Bakersville, Saturday, September Burnsville, Monday, September 7th, Marshall, Tuesday, September 8th.

HON. LEE S. OVERMAN. Hillsboro, Saturday, August 29th. Lenoir, Tuesday, September 1st. Dobson, Saturday, September 12th. Norwood, Saturday, September 5th. HON. C. B. AYCOCK. Greensboro, Saturday, September

HON. A. L. BROOKS. Dobson, Tuesday, September 1st, HON. E. Y. WEBB. Rutherfordton, Tuesday, September 25th. HON. W. T. CRAWFORD AND

HON. T. W. BICKETT. Columbus, Saturday, August 29th. Hendersonville, Monday August Brevard, Tuesday, September 1st. Asheville, Wednesday, September Weaverville, Thursday, Septembers Waynesville, Friday, September Webster, Saturday, September 5th. Robbinsville, Monday, Septemper

Andrews (night) Monday, Septem-Hayesville, Tuesday, September 5th Murphy, Wednesday, Bryson City, Thursday, September Franklin, Saturday,

12th.
Old Fort, Monday, September 14th,
Marion, Tuesday, September 15th,
Forest City (night) Tuesday, Sep-All citizens are invited to be present the above appointments and he

Chairman State Democratic ocratic Execu-ALEX. J. FEILD.