

sumers. Remove a large part of the producers while retaining the consumers, and prices will go up. This is nature's method of protecting man. When the supply is lessened more economy must be practiced, and rising prices compel economy. Yet grave and dignified legislators solemnly pass bills to set aside the laws of nature. "But," some protest, "we are not engaged in war; there is no reason why our prices should go up." What foolishness! Trade tends always to establish a common level of prices; and to expect food to advance in Europe and not in America would be on a par with trying to make the water in an open vessel stand at a higher level on one side than on the other. Let no one try to deceive himself; we must bear our share of the war's burdens. S. O.



### Food Price Investigation.

The ever mounting price of foods has brought an order for an investigation. If the result of previous investigations of the same thing be accepted as a criterion, there is little hope for practical results from the present one. These previous investigations generally showed that the investigators either did not recognize the fundamental trouble when they saw it, or did not know what to do about it when they did recognize it. The present investigation is also doomed to failure if there is no other remedy in view than enforcement of certain prohibitory laws or enactment of more laws of the same kind.



If the present investigation should be no more thorough than previous ones the blame will eventually be laid on the war, or some individuals will be made scapegoats. If it should be a thorough one the investigators will see that it is due to our own folly in failing to take note in time of fundamental evils. It is true that the war is shutting out imports, even as a protective tariff would shut them out. It is true that peace would remove the obstruction caused by war, even as Free Trade would remove a similar obstruction caused by tariffs. But neither war nor tariffs offer an excuse for failure to use our natural resources. Had these resources been kept open and had we not enacted foolish laws interfering in many ways with production, there would now be neither a scarcity of food, nor any possibility of an artificial monopoly. The war would have caused us inconvenience, anxiety and trouble, without a doubt. But it would not and could not have caused a scarcity of the things which could be produced from our vast unused resources.

That investigators should shrink from pointing out the fundamental cause and its obvious remedy is natural. They have good cause to doubt whether so faithful a performance of duty would be appreciated as it should be. Realizing the difficulties in the way of applying an effective remedy, and feeling that a suggestion to apply it would be unwelcome, they will not be altogether to blame should they side step the issue and offer some popular but utterly useless suggestion.

S. D.



### Still Toying With the Trust Problem.

The dissolution of the Harvester Trust ordered by the Federal Court is only another example of the ridiculous child's play involved in prevailing methods of handling the trust problem. The decision may be annoying and expensive to the Trust. It is of no value whatever to the public except as it may be a means of teaching the folly of such proceedings. The Trust can be forced to disintegrate but there is no power that can compel the different parts to compete.



The Harvester Trust derives its power to shut out competition either from some government-conferred privilege or from ability to perform better service than any one else can perform even under free conditions. If its power is due to privilege then the remedy is to abolish the privilege. If it is due to superior natural ability to serve the public then there is nothing to remedy. In either case the court decree is contrary to common sense, however much it may be in accordance with law.

S. D.



### Ohio's Poor Choice.

There is this much to be said in favor of the Republicans of Ohio. They had to choose between Joseph B. Foraker and Warren G. Harding for a senatorial candidate. They chose Harding, the lesser evil, though a very great evil for all that. The Democrats, on the other hand, made the worst possible choice. They chose a candidate whose election will disgrace the party, even as it was disgraced in the days of McLean rule, when Tories like Payne and Brice were sent to the Senate and John R. McLean was with difficulty kept out.

S. D.



### Ohio's Tory Democratic Nominee.

Ohio democrats must go outside of the Democratic party for a democratic senatorial candi-