

days prior to the meeting of the national convention.

The Democratic call, signed by James K. Jones as chairman of the national committee and C. A. Walsh as secretary, was issued on the 18th. It announces that the committee has appointed (p. 647) July 6 as the time and chosen St. Louis as the place for the convention, and declares:

Each State is entitled to representation therein equal to the number of its senators and representatives in the Congress of the United States, and each Territory, Alaska, Indian Territory and the District of Columbia shall have six delegates. All Democratic citizens of the United States who can unite with us in the effort for a pure and economical Constitutional government are cordially invited to join us in sending delegates to the convention.

Mr. Bryan, since his return from Europe (p. 647), has again come into prominence as a Democratic leader whose large following must be reckoned with. On the 18th he was given a great and enthusiastic reception at a banquet in his home city, Lincoln, at which he spoke on "The Moral Issue," in the same spirit as in his New Haven speech (p. 647); but on this occasion he was more specific, and, what was most significant, he broadly intimated to the "reorganizing" Democrats that the battle they will have to fight in the convention will be one of principles and platform rather than one of candidates. On this point he said:

The Kansas City platform is sound in every plank, and the first act of the next Democratic convention should be to reaffirm it in its entirety, and its next act should be the addition of new planks in harmony with it and covering such new questions as demand consideration.

But he did not ignore the question of candidates. He merely made it secondary to the question of platform, for he continued:

Then the convention should select candidates who believe in the platform—candidates whose Democracy will not be an issue in the campaign and whose fidelity to Democratic principles will not be doubted at the election.

Regarding Democratic candidates, the movement for the nomination of William Randolph Hearst has now assumed large

proportions and is being apprehensively considered by other candidates. Until the current week Mr. Hearst's views have found few channels for expression outside of his own papers, published in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and San Francisco; but the press generally is now exploiting him, and on the 19th the Chicago Tribune (Republican) published an extended interview with him, in which he outlined his idea of national issues. Referring to the conservative sentiment of the country Mr. Hearst said:

I should define conservatism as the preservation of those qualities, rights, and principles of proved value to the American people. I think that the fundamental American ideas which have developed this country, making its national wealth and greatness, while fostering the individual happiness and prosperity of its citizens should be conserved. I am conservative in the sense that I believe in the spirit and in the letter of the United States Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and in the characters and purposes of such men as Washington, Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln. Too often, unfortunately, those that call themselves the conservative element are endeavoring to introduce radical departures from these old conservative principles. I do not think my views are in conflict with those of any citizen, however conservative, if his conservatism takes the form of an earnest desire to preserve and perpetuate the original American form of government, and the liberty, equality, independence, and opportunity guaranteed under it. But I am in conflict with those so-called conservatives that are reverting to the ideas of former centuries and of other nations, seeking to exploit the mass of the people for their own profit. Such men are reactionary, they are not conservative.

Following these views on conservatism, Mr. Hearst discussed the trust question, regarding which he said:

I am in favor of organization and combination whenever the people are allowed to participate fully in the economies and advantages which result from combination. I am opposed to the combinations that establish virtual monopolies, and instead of making the people partners in the improved industrial conditions inflate their stock, increase the cost of the product, reduce wages through a monopoly of the employing power, interfere with the creation and distribution of wealth.

Asked what issues he considered paramount, he replied:

The main issue of a party of the peo-

ple is to attend to the main business before the people. The universal tendency of to-day is toward industrial combination and organization. The great issue of the day, therefore, is the regulation and control of that tendency to organization—in other words, the trust issue. In a mining region, the chief issue is the mining laws. In a cattle country, the chief issue is the laws affecting cattle and pasture. In this country of sudden trust development, the one dominating issue—made so by the trusts themselves—is the trust issue. The growth of the new industrial system on lines of wide combination cannot and should not be checked. But it can be kept within lines that will benefit the whole community and entirely suppressed along lines dangerous to public welfare. The trusts must be kept within the law, and if there are no laws strong enough to control them, then such laws must be made. The people are determined to dominate and direct the trusts and not to be dominated by them. They will find a way to bring that about.

Other points on which Mr. Hearst replied to the reporter's inquiries were the tariff, the Isthmian canal, the labor question and the money question. He favors protection "in order to promote any industry of which the full development will benefit all," but opposes it "when it becomes obvious that an enterprise protected by the tariff is a menace instead of a benefit to the country." Regarding the Isthmian canal, he prefers the Nicaragua route, but "if the party in power has positively determined to build no canal but the Panama canal, then it would not become the Democratic party to block what may be for the present the only obtainable solution of the canal problem." While "the demands of trade unions are not always just or wise," Mr. Hearst sympathizes with unionism as against trusts because "the unions at least ask pay for labor which they actually perform," and in illustration of his opinion on this point he narrates the following interesting and suggestive personal experience:

In my business, the producing of newspapers, there came simultaneously two demands. The trust demanded an increased price for paper and one of the unions demanded an increased price for labor. A number of my brother newspaper owners gathered in my office and suggested a union of newspapers to prevent an increase in the wages of the workers. I asked them why it would not be better to combine to prevent the trust from getting its arbitrary increase