

# J. L. STOCKTON THE OLD WHITE CORNER

## NEW GOODS ARRIVING DAILY

### Dress Goods Special

40 BOLTS OF NOVELTY SETTINGS IN BOTH LIGHT AND DARK SHADES, ALL VERY DESIRABLE PATTERNS, THIS SPRING'S PURCHASES INCLUDED.

50c to 75c VALUES

**38c yd**

### Wash Goods

A BIG ASSORTMENT OF 15c TO 35c VALUES TO CLOSE OUT AT—

**9c yd**

### Great Shirtwaist Sale

SILK, COTTON AND WOOL WAISTS, 50c TO \$7.00 VALUES FOR—

**25c**

IT IS TRUE THAT THE STYLES ARE NOT THE VERY LATEST, BUT THEY WILL COMPARE VERY WELL WITH THOSE YOU BOUGHT LAST SEASON AND ARE STILL WEARING. THE SILKS ARE IN ALL COLORS AND ARE WORTH TEN TIMES THE PRICE WE ASK FOR THEM.

**Real 50c to \$7.00 Waists Reduced to 25c**

### BRYAN'S ADDRESSES

(Continued from Page 1.)

How does the Republican party show its real indifference to reform more than in its treatment of the trust question. Here is the Republican platform:

"The Republican party passed the Sherman anti-trust law over Democratic opposition and enforced it after Democratic dereliction. It has been a wholesome instrument for good in the hands of a wise and fearless administration. But experience has shown that its effectiveness can be strengthened and its real objects better attained by amendments as will give to the federal government greater supervision and control over, and secure greater publicity in the management of that class of corporations engaged in interstate commerce, having power and opportunity to affect monopolies."

The Sherman anti-trust law was passed 18 years ago; it has a criminal clause which provides a penalty for those who violate it. Ever since the enactment of the law, with the exception of four years, the Republican party has controlled the executive department of the house of representatives. In the face of Democratic dereliction, the Republican party has been urging, year after year, the strict enforcement of that law and the Republican party has been expounding

year after year why it was impossible to enforce it.

Instead of being a "wholesome instrument for good," it has been almost useless, so far as the protection of the public is concerned, for the trusts have grown in number, in strength and in arrogance, at the very time when the Republican party was boasting of its enforcement of law. The steel trust was formed immediately after the election in 1900, and a prominent Republican said, in a speech soon after, that it might have prevented a Republican victory if it had been formed before the election.

Most of the trusts have never been disturbed and those that have been prosecuted have not had their business seriously interrupted. The President has done something toward the enforcement of the law but not nearly enough, and the Republican leaders have thwarted him at every point. Finally the trust at every point. Finally the President became so exasperated that he sent to congress a message which shocked Republican leaders by the fierceness of its denunciation of the predatory interests. The very convention that spoke in its platform of the administration as "a wise and fearless one," was composed largely of the senators and members of congress who boldly opposed every effort to free the people from the clutches of the favor-seeking corporations.

The Republican platform says that experience has shown that the effectiveness of the anti-trust law could be strengthened by amendments which will give the federal government greater supervision and control over, and greater publicity as to the management of those interstate commerce corporations which have the power and opportunity to effect monopolies. That is all. No pointing out of remedies; no outlining of a plan for more effective legislation—simply a general statement that promises nothing in particular. And Mr. Taft's speech of acceptance is even weaker than the platform. He gives no evidence of having studied the question or of comprehending the iniquities of a monopoly. You look in vain in his notification speech for any sign of indignation at what the trusts have been doing or for evidence of zeal in their prosecution. He has, for several years, been an intimate official companion of the President, but he has caught none of the fire which the President manifested in his message of last January.

If in the presence of an aroused people, and in the heat of a campaign, the Republican party contents itself with a colorless platform on this subject, what can we expect in the way of activity when the exigencies of the campaign are passed? If, when Mr. Taft is ap-

pealing to the Roosevelt Republicans, his discussion of the subject is so lifeless and his manner so apologetic and apathetic, what reason have we to expect either vigor in the enforcement of the law or earnestness in the search for additional remedies?

In his speech delivered about a year ago announcing his candidacy Mr. Taft suggested that the present law be so amended so as to permit "reasonable" restraint of trade. Such an amendment would be as absurd as an amendment to the law against burglary limiting the law to cases in which more than two burglars entered the house at one time and took more than half they found. In his notification speech he suggests national incorporation—a remedy which would make conditions worse because, without adding to the power of congress to prevent monopolies, it would deprive the states of the power to protect their own people.

Now let me contrast the Democratic platform with the Republican platform. Nowhere is the difference in the method of dealing with questions more manifest. Our platform says:

A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. We therefore favor the vigorous enforcement of the criminal law against guilty trust magnate and officials, and demand the enactment of such additional legislation as may be necessary to make it impossible for a private monopoly to exist in the United States. Among the additional remedies, we specify three:

First, a law preventing a duplication of directors among competing corporations;

Second, a license system which will, without abridging the right of each state to create corporations, or its right to regulate as it will foreign corporations doing business within its limits, make it necessary for a manufacturing or trading corporation engaged in interstate commerce 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, the license to protect the public from watered stock and to prohibit the control by such corporation of more than 50 per cent 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 on the same terms, after making due allowance for cost of transportation."

Here is a plain, candid statement of the parties position. There is no quibbling, no evasion, no ambiguity. A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. It is bad—bad in principle and bad in practice. No apology can be offered for it, and no people should endure it. Our party's position is entirely in harm-

ony with the position of Jefferson. With a knowledge of human nature which few men have equalled and none surpassed, and with extraordinary foresight, he expressed unalterable opposition to every form of private monopoly. The student of history will find that upon this subject, as upon other subjects of government, the great founder of the Democratic party took his position upon the side of the whole people and against those who seek to make a private use of government, or strive to secure special privileges at the expense of the public.

I have, in discussing the tariff question, presented one of our remedies, namely, the repeal of the tariff from imports which compete with trust-made goods. This, we believe, would greatly lessen the extortion practiced by the trusts and bring about the dissolution of many monopolistic combines. But we are not satisfied merely with the lessening of extortion or with the dissolution of some of the trusts.

It is impossible for the Republican party to enforce the present criminal law against trust officials; these officials are intimately connected with the Republican party in the present campaign. Take, for instance, the chairman of the Republican speakers' committee, Mr. Dupont of Delaware. He is the defendant in a suit which the government brought and is now prosecuting. Mr. Dupont is charged with violation of the anti-trust law. Mr. Taft favors control of trusts instead of extermination, but after years of experience the people have learned that the trusts control the government. As stated in the Democratic platform it is:

"A license system which will, without abridging the right of each state to create corporations, or its right to regulate as it will foreign corporations doing business within its limits, make it necessary for a manufacturing or trading corporation engaged in interstate commerce 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, the license to protect the public from watered stock and to prohibit the control by such corporation of more than 50 per cent of the total amount of any production consumed in the United States."

As long as a corporation confines itself to the state in which it is created, congress can not interfere with it; but when the corporation engages in interstate commerce, congress is the only power that can regulate its interstate business.

We want to make it unlawful for a corporation to use the instrumentalities of interstate commerce for the carrying out of a monopolistic purpose. Surely no party can consistently claim to be opposed to private monopolies which will permit the interstate railroads to be used to carry out the designs of a

monopoly, or which will permit the interstate telegraph lines to be used to increase the power of a private 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 lotteries. Why not exercise it to make private monopolies impossible?

The license system presents an easy way of regulating such corporations as need federal regulation. The law can not prohibit the doing of a thing and impose a penalty for the violation of the law, but experience has shown that it is very difficult to gather up evidence from all sections of the United States and prosecute a great corporation.

The license, however, would not permit the growth of the corporations licensed. One of the restrictions suggested is that such licensed corporations be compelled to sell all purchasers in all parts of the country on the same terms, after making due allowance for cost of transportation. Mr. Taft attacks this restriction as "utterly impracticable." He says:

"If 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 country, where it has competitors, at 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."

He says: "To supervise the business of corporations in such a way as to fix the price of commodities and compel the sale at such price is as absurd and socialistic a plank as was ever inserted in a Democratic political platform."

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 corporation to attempt to destroy a competitor by selling at a low and unprofitable price where it has competition, and at an exorbitant price where it has no competition. In what respect is our plan more socialistic than the plank which Mr. Taft indorses?

According to Mr. Taft's logic, a plan is not socialistic which is not effective, but the same would be socialistic if made effective.

No one proposes to interfere with production on a large scale. No one objects to production on a scale sufficiently large to enable the producer to utilize by-products and take advantage of all the economies that large production makes possible.

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 corporations; on the contrary, it recognizes that the corporation can render an 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 monopoly and desires that a private monopoly cannot be justified on either economic or political grounds.

Wherever private monopolies exist, certain irresistible tendencies manifest themselves. First, it raises price—this is the first thing thought of, for the increasing of profits. Then, in proportions as it becomes the only purchaser of the raw material, it reduces the price of the raw material, and the producer of that raw material, having no market, must accept the price offered.

Competition protects the purchaser, for when a number of independent producers stand ready to supply him with what he needs, he can choose between them and buy from the one who offers the best product at the lowest price.

Mr. Taft either misunderstands or misrepresents the Democratic position in regard to the extermination of the principle of private monopoly. In his notification speech in which he says:

"Mr. Roosevelt would compel the trusts to conduct their business in a lawful manner and secure the benefits of their operation and the maintenance of the prosperity of the country 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 the play an important part in the maintenance of prosperity, and he charges that I would "extirpate and destroy" business in extirpating 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 competition.

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 on, and not yet aroused to the iniquity of these trusts, how can the country hope for relief through his election?

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 professing to abhor socialism, the Republican party has gone half way toward socialism!

(Continued on page eight.)

## BARGAINS

ITS NOTHING NEW FOR YOU TO FIND EXCEPTIONAL BARGAINS IN OUR CARPET DEPARTMENT, IN FACT THAT'S WHAT YOU ARE ACCUSTOMED TO—BUT THE SPECIAL OFFERING THIS WEEK IN ROOM-SIZE INGRAIN RUGS IN BROWN AND ECRU CANNOT BE DUPLICATED ELSEWHERE AT DOUBLE THE PRICE. THE MILL HAS DISCONTINUED THIS PATTERN SO WE CANNOT RE-ORDER AND HAVE DECIDED TO CLOSE THEM OUT ON A BASIS OF 50c PER YARD

9x7-6 - - - \$3.75  
9x9 - - - \$4.50  
9x10-6 - - - \$5.25  
9x12 - - - \$6.00



Buren & Hamilton  
HOUSE FURNISHERS

### MOONSTONE

For August

"Wear Moonstone, or for thee No congenial felicity."

Moonstone received its name from the ancients because it was thought to enclose the image of Diana, one of the forms of the moon-goddess Hecate.

Moonstone jewelry is very popular with the August born.

Our stock of birthstone jewelry always affords a wide range of choice stones for every month.

Barr's Jewelry Store  
State and Liberty Streets.