NATHAN J. HARRIS SQUEALS

He is Caught in Knowingly Making False Statements--He Is Offered $500 to Prove His Statements to Be True.

He Waits Until tne Last Day and Issues a Circular on Mr. Glasmann—But Doesn't Claim the $500—Knowing He is Defeated on False Statements He Has Circulated, Mr. Harris' Latest Attempt to Fool the People Will Not Work -Every Man Should Scratch Harris' Name, as He is Not Fair to the People.

On October 29th the Standard printed the following article, in which $500 is offered to Mr. Harris to prove the article to be untrue. Instead of Mr. Harris answering through the Standard, as he is entitled to do, he waited until today when he published a circular. He did not intend for the circular to get into the Standard's hands until after the paper went to press tonight. But the Standard editor heard about the circular being printed so we sent a man to W. W. Browning's printing office, who was able to get a copy. The circular is all rot, as it pretends to reprint something that was published in the Standard years ago. It is the old statement in which Mr. Harris tries to insinuate that Governor Wells, C. C. Goodwin, Wm. Glasmann and 20,000 republicans who voted for Bryan four years ago, were bought with gold to support McKinley this time. If Mr. Harris thinks that he makes a point by charging a majority of the people of Utah with selling out, he is welcome to the point.

Here is our statement as printed one week ago, offering $500 for Mr. Harris to prove the false statements he has made to be true:

TRUSTS IN NATION

Arguments Presented by William Glasmann are Sustained.

The Standard Editor is in receipt of the following:

Pleasant View, Utah: "Last evening John Seaman and N. J. Harris spoke at this place and both gentlemen stated that the statements made by Mr. Glasmann a few evenings before at this place were false and misleading. Mr. Harris said that all Mr. Glasmann said about the trusts was false and untrue. He further said that Mr. McKinley's attorney general, John W. Griggs never even brought or tried one suit against a trust. Our people hardly believe that Mr. Glasmann would have said that the attorney general did try the suits mentioned unless it was true and there are those who say that Mr. Harris was so emphatic in his statements that they are in doubt which told the truth. Will the Standard please furnish the proof."

It is nothing new for the Standard to learn that John Seaman and N. J. Harris pronounce everybody liars, who fail to agree with them.

NOW FOR TRUST.

Mr. Harris knew he was misleading the people when he said that McKinley's attorney general had not prosecuted the trusts because he is a lawyer and he reads the Supreme court reports and he knows that what he said was untrue.

We take the following cases from the proceedings of the Supreme court of the United States; for 1899 all trust cases, two-thirds of which were directly prosecuted by J. W. Griggs of New Jersey, President McKinley's attorney general:

1. United States vs. Whiskey trust.
2. United States vs. Lumber trust.
3. United States vs. Cash Register trust.
4. United States vs. Salt Lake City coal combine.
5. United States vs. California coal combine.
6. United States vs. Kansas City Live Stock trust.
7. United States vs. Traders' Live Stock trust.
8. United States vs. Trans-Missouri Freight association in which nine railroads formed a pool.
9. United States vs. Joint Traffic association; thirty-one railroads formed a pool.
10. United States vs. Sugar trust.
11. United States vs. Steel, Iron and Pipe trust.
12. United States vs. Nashville coal combine.
13. United States vs. Chesapeake & Ohio Fuel trust.

Without fear of truthful contradiction, the Standard charges and asserts that these suits were prosecuted to a finish by the attorney general of the United States.

The Democratic attorney general who preceded Attorney General Griggs for four long years said the Sherman Anti-Trust law, passed by the Republicans under President Harrison, was unconstitutional, yet no sooner did McKinley get in power than every power of the government was used to enforce the anti-trust law, with the result that out of thirteen cases tried under the Sherman Anti-Trust law, three of the greatest trusts, namely the Iron, Steel and Pipe trust, the Trans-Missouri Freight pool and the Joint Traffic association were dissolved and destroyed. The Supreme court held these three trusts were such trusts as the government could destroy. All the others, said the Supreme court, must be handled by the State. The Supreme court of the United States, the highest authority in this nation, says that the government can interfere only with trusts that cover more than one state. The Steel and Iron trust covered thirteen states, and, accordingly was dissolved. The Trans-Missouri Traffic association covered nine states and was dissolved. The Joint Traffic association covered still more states, and it too, was dissolved, but the Sugar Trust refineries, the Supreme court held, did not cover more than one state, hence the United States was powerless.

The Supreme court says: "The state legislatures can say what methods of bargain and sale, what forms of commercial or labor contracts, what kinds of corporations or partnerships, shall be permissible within their several jurisdictions. The power of control or regulation by the United States exists only in exceptional instances where actually conferred by the constitution of the United States."

Again it stated, "That unless the constitution can be made to give the Federal Government more power, the right to regulate the trade and commerce in the states must be left with the people of the several states."

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

It is therefore plain that after the United States Supreme court has declared that a trust must cover more than one state before the government can interfere in a state, that a constitutional amendment is necessary to destroy the trusts in the states. To accomplish that the Republicans presented in the present Congress an amendment to the constitution giving the government power to destroy trusts in states as well as out of states. Bryan recommended in his Chicago trust speech that the constitution should be amended, yet out of 163 Democratic Congressmen only five Democrats voted for the amendment. It requires a two-thirds majority in Congress to pass a constitutional amendment. The Republicans did not have a two-thirds majority so it failed, thus showing that the Republicans up to this time are the only people opposing trusts, while the Democrats favored the trusts every time there was a chance to injure them.

SHUT UP OR PUT UP.

The Standard hereby offers to wager the sum of $500, or any part of it, that the statement above made concerning trusts is substantially correct and we are ready to present the proofs at ten minutes notice.

It is easy to go on the stump and call other people liars and falsifiers but to present the proof is another matter. The Standard editor deals only in facts and truths and, if John Seaman or N. J. Harris want to prove themselves honest, truthful gentlemen, here is a chance to do it and make $500 in addition. Come gentlemen, prove your statements.