

JOURNEYING IN LAND OF DREAMS

Impracticable Democratic Proposition for Trust Control.

Convincing Exposition of Fallacy of Bryan's Panacea for Solving Problems of Modern Business.

(From Gov. Hughes' Youngstown speech.)

When we consider remedies that are proposed for the trusts, we find ourselves journeying in a land of dreams. Again the magician of 1863 waves his wand. At a stroke difficulties disappear and the complex problems of modern business are forgotten in the fascination of the simple panacea. And as the free coinage of silver in the ratio of 16 to 1 was to destroy the curse of gold, so the new found species of equal perfection is to remove the curse of industrial oppression. The disillusion of 1908 is comparable only to that of twelve years ago.

The first suggestion is that the law should prevent a duplication of directors among competing corporations. However advisable it may be to have independent directorates of competing corporations, it would seem still more important to have independent stockholders, for a majority of the stockholders of a corporation choose the directors. If a law were passed preventing the duplication of directors it would easily be evaded in the selection of men who would represent the same interests. The most ordinary experience shows that it is not necessary to serve on a board of directors in order to control its proceedings. Whatever the advantage of such a law as it proposed, it hardly rises to the dignity of a "remedy," or vindicates its title to a place in an imposing scheme of reform outlined in a national platform.

But the more important proposal is "that any manufacturing or trading corporation engaged in interstate commerce shall be required to take out a federal license before it shall be permitted to control as much as 25 per cent of the product in which it deals." A license is permission, and the object of the remedy is not to regulate large businesses, but to destroy trusts. Hence the supposed efficiency of the plan is to be found in the prohibition of the control by any such corporation "of more than 50 per cent of the total amount of any product consumed in the United States." This is another delusion of狂。

It might be interesting to inquire what is the meaning of "any product consumed in the United States." Does it refer to a class of commodities? And, if so, how shall the classes be defined? Or does it refer to each separate article of commerce? And, if so, what account does this proposal take of the skill and initiative of manufacturers who have built up more or less exclusive trade in particular articles, often protected by trademarks, although in most active competition with other articles designed for the same general purpose and seeking the same market? In a desire to correct the evils of business are we to place an embargo upon honest endeavor whose activities present none of the abuses requiring remedies? And, if not, what statutory definitions shall be found to be adequate and just? If we lay down our prohibition in terms of volume or ratio of business and not in terms of right and wrong? If we adopt Mr. Bryan's proposal, to what period of production is the prohibition to apply? Is the excess for a day or for a month to be considered? Or is the average production for a year to be taken? And what system shall be devised by which suitable information may be furnished in the nature of danger signals along the routes of trade so that the manufacturer may know when he is about to exceed the prescribed ratio? He may justly be required to govern his own conduct, but how shall he be apprised of the conduct of others upon which is to depend his guilt or innocence?

The patent laws confer a true monopoly in the exclusive right to manufacture and sell. Are these laws to be repealed because a "private monopoly" is indefensible and intolerable?

Bryan's Crude Reasoning.

An example of Mr. Bryan's reasoning is found in his statement that "when a corporation controls 50 per cent of the total product it supplies forty millions of people with that product." There are, of course, specialties which have a limited market and are used by a relatively small number of the people of the United States. More than 50 per cent, and indeed even as much as 100 per cent of the trade in such articles may be in the control of a particular corporation. This may, in fact, be relatively a small corporation. It may never have aspired to the unsavory renown of a "trust." But by prosecuting its particular line with fidelity and meeting satisfactorily a limited want, or by reason of some secret processes or advantage of experience, it may control the trade in a given article. Suppose, for instance, that the trade in a given article is controlled. Or suppose a concern controls the whole trade in some useful byproduct which it has found it advantageous to make, is the trade to be prohibited?

The Democratic platform makes no

exception to cover such cases, and we have learned that it is equally "blinding as to what it enacts."

If we could imagine such a crude prohibition to be enacted into law, and to be regarded as valid, what would be the effect? Mr. Bryan, with his usual readiness, suggests that the concern may sell as much of its plants as are not needed to produce the amount allowed by law. He speaks as though every manufacturing concern had as many fully equipped units of production as would correspond to any given percentage of trade which it might be required to lay off. Plants are not so easily dismembered. Reduced output means reduction in work, reduction in the number of men employed and curtailment of the efficiency of a going concern. Let us suppose a concern which controls 50 per cent of a given product—that is to say, makes and sells \$8,000,000 to value out of a total trade in the product amounting to \$10,000,000. Is it to be compelled to reduce its output to \$2,000,000 because only \$2,000,000 in value are made by others? Then, if it could sell a part of its plant on Mr. Bryan's theory, what should it sell? Should it sell off enough to reduce its capacity to \$5,000,000, and allow three-fifths of its plant to remain idle until others developed a capacity for handling the other \$5,000,000? Should it assume that the total trade will increase and is not always to remain at \$10,000,000, and hence retain a larger portion of its plant in idleness? Or suppose a concern controls 100 per cent of the trade in some article, what plants shall it retain? It can produce nothing until others produce, but it may produce an amount equal to the production of others, and it hopes the trade will grow. What a vision of business uncertainty and confusion of idle and impeded plants, of the ruin of workmen whose lives have clustered around particular industries and who depend upon their continued efficiency, is presented by this fanciful remedy for the destruction of trusts!

Apart from this, if the dissolution were effected in the manner desired and portions of plants could be sold and were sold as suggested, to whom would the sale be made? Would it be necessarily to fees or to those ambitious to be competitors and anxious to take advantage of its plight?

This proposal in its utter disregard of the facts of business, in its substitution of the phantasies of the imagination for the realities of life, stamps the Democratic platform with the fatal stamp of 1863. The commerce and industry of this country, the interests of wage earners and of its interdependent masses, who must rely upon the stability of business, cannot afford to give license to such vagaries.

In the solemnity with which this proposal has been declared, and the insistence with which it is advocated, we find an appropriate test of the capacity of our opponents to deal wisely with the problems of the day.

LABOR WORLD FOR TAFT.

Characterizes Him as True Friend of the Workingman.

(From the Concord (N. H.) Monitor.)

The Labor World comes out strongly in its advocacy of Mr. Taft. It characterizes him a true friend of labor and desires that the unfair attacks of Mr. Gompers will have little or no effect in alienating from him the labor world. It says: "That Secretary Taft is a true friend of labor is certain, and all the untrue, ungenerous, vicious attacks that President Gompers or any one else may make on him cannot prevent him from continuing to be the friend of the wage worker. Organized labor cannot afford to have itself split up into factions on this political issue. That President Gompers is wrong in forcing this most ominous fight is certain, and intelligent wage workers will certainly come to this conclusion."

Campaign Funds.

"We welcome Mr. Taft to this advanced ground," said Mr. Bryan in one of his numerous interviews since the Denver convention. The ground referred to is Mr. Taft's statement that no campaign contributions would be received from corporations. Mr. Bryan intended to convey the impression that Mr. Taft had come to that determination after the Denver convention. In that the Democratic "peerless one" is not honest. Mr. Taft is a law abiding citizen. Such contributions are unlawful, made so by a law passed by a Republican congress at the instance of a Republican administration of which Judge Taft was a part six months before the Denver convention. Be honest, Mr. Bryan, if you can!

Colonel Bryan laments the "discrimination that has been going on against the farmer" in electing so few tillers of the soil to Congress and the Senate. What troubles him chiefly, however, is the discrimination which the whole American nation exercises against a certain farmer of Lincoln, Neb., in declining to elect him to the White House.—New York Tribune.

Toos Matures.
"Good story," said Nob, "that Wiggs ever told."
"Of the fellow the hornet stung?"
It scarcely was that," said Dindieber.
"It's true that the good die young."—Philadelphia Press

A Choice.
"Expense me," sputtered the victim to the barber, "but if you intend to put so much father in my mouth I wish you'd shave me with whipped cream or mayonnaise dressing."—Judge.

1908 SEPTEMBER 1908

SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

NOTICE FOR PUBLICATION

NOT COAL LAND

Department of the Interior,

U. S. Land Office

The Dalles, Oregon, August 28th 1908

Notice is hereby given that James E. Fuller, of Sisters, Oregon, who on

June 29th 1907, made Homestead

Entry-Serial No. 0739-No. 15630, for

Lot 4 Sec 3 Lot 1 and $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec 4 See 4,

15 S. R. 11 East, Willamette

Meridian, has filed notice of intention

to make Final Commutation Proof, to

establish claim to the land above de-

scribed, before Warren Brown, County

Clerk at his office, at Prineville, Oregon,

on the 15th day of October, 1908

Claimant names as witnesses:

Elias Johnson,

Elisha R. Jones,

Robert A. Ford,

Fred Weise, all of Sisters, Oregon.

C. W. Moore, Register.

NOTICE FOR PUBLICATION

NOT COAL LAND

Department of the Interior,

U. S. Land Office at The Dalles, Oregon,

August 29th 1908

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT ROBERT M.

WRIGHT OF SISTERS, OREGON, WHO ON

JUNE 11TH 1902 MADE HOMESTEAD

ENTRY-SERIAL NO. 0584 NO. 11067 FOR

15 E. NW 1/4 NE 1/4 SE 1/4 SECTION 26

TOWNSHIP 15 SOUTH RANGE 10 EAST, WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN, HAS FILED NOTICE OF INTENTION TO MAKE FINAL PROOF, TO ESTABLISH CLAIM TO THE LAND ABOVE DESCRIBED, BEFORE WARREN BROWN, COUNTY CLERK, AT HIS OFFICE, AT PRINEVILLE, OREGON, ON THE 6TH DAY OF OCTOBER 1908.

CLAIMANT NAMES AS WITNESSES:

F. W. McCaffery, of Redmond, Oregon

Minnie E. McCaffery of Redmond, Oregon

N. C. Foster, of Sisters, Oregon

W. S. Cobb, of Sisters, Oregon

C. W. Moore, Register.

NOTICE FOR PUBLICATION

NOT COAL LAND

Department of the Interior,

U. S. Land Office, The Dalles, Oregon

September 11, 1908

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT JOHN E.

EDWARDS, OF GIST, OREGON, WHO ON

SEPTEMBER 29, 1904, MADE DESERT LAND

ENTRY, [SERIAL NO. 0984] NO. 483, FOR

SW 1/4 SEC 12, SE 1/4 SEC 11, AND

SW 1/4 SEC 14, Twp 168, Range 10 E.

Willamette Meridian, has filed notice

of intention to make final proof, to

establish claim to the land above de-

scribed, before H. C. Ellis, United States Commissioner at his office at Bend, Oregon, on the 21st day of October, 1908.

CLAIMANT NAMES AS WITNESSES:

Oscar S. Edwards, James A. McCall,

George W. McCallister, John H.

Edwards, all of Gist, Oregon.

C. W. Moore, Register.

NOTICE FOR PUBLICATION

NOT COAL LAND

Department of the Interior,

U. S. Land Office The Dalles, Oregon

July 24th, 1908

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT MARIA

MURK, SIGNER OF JOHN A. JOHNSON,

OF LAIDLAW, OREGON, WHO, ON

SEPTEMBER 19TH, 1903, MADE HOMESTEAD

ENTRY, [SERIAL NO. 0292] NO. 12926, FOR

1/4 SEC 3 AND LOT 1 - NW 1/4 SECTION 7, TOWNSHIP 17 SOUTH, RANGE

12 EAST, WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN, HAS

FILED NOTICE OF INTENTION TO MAKE

FINAL PROOF, TO ESTABLISH CLAIM TO

THE LAND ABOVE DESCRIBED, BEFORE H.

C. ELLIS, UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER,

AT HIS OFFICE, AT BEND, OREGON, ON

THE 24TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1908.

CLAIMANT NAMES AS WITNESSES:

F. E. DAYTON, OF LAIDLAW, OREGON

F. N. WALLACE, OF LAIDLAW, OREGON

V. J. HARTER, OF LAIDLAW, OREGON

W. W. BROWN, OF LAIDLAW, OREGON

C. W. MOORE, REGISTER.

NOTICE FOR PUBLICATION

[Isolated Tract]

Serial No. 0420

PUBLIC LAND SALE

United States Land Office

The Dalles, Oregon, Aug. 12, 1908

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT AS

DIRECTED BY THE COMMISSIONER OF THE