

may win success by deserving it. It may obtain confidence by proving itself worthy, or it may invite disastrous defeat.

It remains with the rank and file of the democratic party to say what the party's course shall be. No one will for a moment doubt the course which would be adopted by the rank and file, if they avail themselves of the duty to register their preference at the primaries. But a systematic organization will be necessary in order that democrats may be impressed with the importance of participating in their party's councils.

The Commoner has undertaken to do its part in this work of organization. To this end a plan has already been outlined and further reference to that plan will be found on page 11 of this issue. Every democrat, however humble he may believe himself to be, should take part in this work. Many will be surprised to find how much good may be accomplished by a little vigorous effort on the part even of an obscure member of the party, particularly when that member is conscientiously devoted to the party's principles.

The Commoner desires to reiterate the request that newspapers favoring the organization plan direct attention to the same and reprint the primary pledge. Sufficient space in *The Commoner* will be devoted each week to show the progress the organization is making in various states, giving the names of the organizers and the names of the precinct, township, county and state officers. It will also publish the calls of county and state conventions or mass meetings and will contribute in every possible way to the success of the plan.

The enemies of good government, the beneficiaries of class legislation, act as one man, with unlimited means at their disposal. The people have only their votes and they must cast them together or suffer defeat. Democrats who believe their party should be a party of the people have it in their power through systematic organization to so shape their party's policies and govern its environment for the 1908 campaign that it will command the support of all men who have grown weary of the exactions made by special interests.

Muhlbach relates an incident in the life of the great military hero of France. At Marengo, the man of destiny, sad and disheartened, thought the battle lost. He called to a drummer boy and ordered him to beat a retreat. The lad replied: "Sire, I do not know how; Dessaix has never taught me to retreat; but I can beat a charge! Oh, I can beat a charge that would make the dead fall into line! I beat that charge at the bridge of Lodi; I beat it at Mount Tabor; I beat it at the Pyramids! Oh, may I beat it here?" The charge was ordered, the battle won, and Marengo was added to the victories of Napoleon.

Let democrats draw inspiration from the street gamin of Paris. Let the command to charge be given and obeyed and this "Marengo" will be our glory and not our shame.

BAD CASE OF "GRAND DUKES"

The Des Moines, Iowa, Register and Leader, a republican paper, warns President Roosevelt against some of his advisors. The Register and Leader says: "The president has made several appointments already that cannot but cause him trouble in states where his personal popularity is greatest. His appointment of Paul Morton to the cabinet was unfortunate."

Mr. Roosevelt seems to be in need of just such warnings as this. Only a few days ago he appointed former Senator Quarles to be federal judge in Wisconsin. It will be remembered that Mr. Quarles led the fight against Governor LaFollette and has been prominently identified with the corporation element.

One newspaper stated the case well when it said that Mr. Roosevelt, like the Czar of Russia, is suffering with a severe case of "grand dukes." If the president does not know that he cannot wage successful campaigns against monopoly when he places the representatives of monopoly upon the bench and in other influential positions, some patriotic republican should break through the line of "grand dukes," and should inform the president that monopoly is not to be driven from its trenches when positions of power and authority among the invading forces are bestowed upon monopoly's representatives.

QUITE A DIFFERENCE

Every intelligent man must have recognized the absurdity of Mr. Garfield's findings with respect to the beef trust. But if one would obtain from an authoritative source valuable information on this subject, he would learn something to his

advantage by reading a statement issued by Cuthbert Powell, commercial editor of the Kansas City Journal. Extracts from Mr. Powell's statement appear in another column of this issue.

It has been Mr. Powell's business, for more than a quarter of a century, to keep close watch on the packing and live stock interests. It will be seen that Mr. Powell's figures do not by any means justify the claim that any of the packers have been losing money, as it was suggested in Mr. Garfield's report was often the case; nor do they justify the contention made by Mr. Garfield that the meat monopoly has made only a net profit of 2 per cent.

Applying the average profit of \$7.41 on cattle, 20 cents on hogs, 50 cents on sheep and 50 cents on calves, to the total number of head killed in a year by the combine's packing houses, Mr. Powell finds a total profit of \$47,727,412. He concludes: "Figuring upon the total capitalization, undoubtedly heavily watered, of \$110,500,000, we have 43 per cent."

Quite a difference between Mr. Garfield's 99 cents profit per head and Mr. Powell's \$7.41 profit; and quite a difference between Mr. Garfield's 2 per cent net profit and Mr. Powell's 43 per cent.

Yet there are some republican editors who point with pride to the Garfield report and insist that it proves that there is no such thing as a beef trust.

SAN DOMINGO TREATY DEFEATED

Having found it impossible to secure the confirmation of the San Domingo treaty which made this nation assume the role of a debt collecting agency the republican leaders of the senate, after consulting with the president, concluded not to bring the matter to a vote. While the democrats were nearly all opposed to any treaty which would involve the United States in the pecuniary disputes constantly arising in the southern republics, they were especially hostile to the San Domingo treaty because of the nature of some of the claims which are held against that country.

Senator Morgan of Alabama called the senate's attention to one case in which a financier charged the San Domingo government a half million for floating a loan of about two millions. The bonds were sold for a little more than a million and the government, after it got through with contractors and middle men, realized something like two hundred thousand dollars. The debt has now grown to about ten million dollars. The European governments have been in the habit of backing up the usurious claims of their citizens and the president argues that unless we did as the Europeans do our citizens would be at a disadvantage. While the reasons given by the president are plausible to those who adopt the commercial view that in dealing with the weaker nations force can be used to collect debts due to individuals, the policy ought at least to carry with it a condition that the loans must be entirely free from fraud and the interest not excessive. If a nation is going to guarantee the collection of loans made by its citizens it ought to compel its citizens to loan at rates customary for safe investments. It is obviously unjust for a nation to allow its citizens to deal on a speculative basis, charging for the risk, and then proceed to eliminate the risk. Even with safeguards against usury such a policy is a dangerous one for us to endorse, because foreign money is invested here and we can not recognize the right of foreign nations to protect the loans of their citizens elsewhere without recognizing their right to compel payment from our citizens. If such a rule is established in the western hemisphere it ought to be accompanied by another rule making it unlawful for any citizen to borrow money outside of his own country or for any government to borrow except from its own citizens. According to the European rule now enforced against the weaker nations a loan is really an invitation to invade the land of the debtor.

COLORADO'S SHAME

Colorado's general assembly did not reflect credit upon the state when it ousted Governor Alva Adams and put in his place James H. Peabody. Whatever opinion one may entertain as to the merits of the charges and counter-charges of frauds on election day, it is significant that ten republicans voted with the democrats against seating Peabody, while those who voted for Peabody did so only after having secured from him a written pledge that after being seated he would resign and permit Lieutenant Governor McDonald to have the place.

These facts show very clearly that while a considerable number of republicans were unwilling

to vote to depose Governor Adams, those who were willing to seat Peabody do not recognize that he has any claim on the place. It is a disgraceful affair, indeed, and the republican party that is responsible for the expulsion of Governor Adams will not profit by the action unless it is by way of learning the lesson taught by history that political organization, as well as individuals, need not expect approval from the people when they yield to the temptation to commit foul deeds.

Although Governor Adams was urged to defend his rights by force and retain the position to which he was elected he declined to accept this advice and promptly surrendered his office. Governor Adams acted wisely. He can well afford to recognize the authority of the legislature and, retiring in good order, await the judgment and, sooner or later, must be recorded against the republican party by the good citizens of Colorado.

NOT A TEST

The Burlington, Iowa, Hawkeye thought it had made a point against municipal ownership by directing attention to the fact that the municipal ownership of the electric light plant by the city of Elgin, Ill., had proved a failure. The Dubuque, Iowa, Telegraph Herald points out that Elgin did not make a fair test of municipal ownership. The administration was not nearly so anxious to serve the public as it was to serve certain special interests. After doing everything in their power to make the experiment fail, the city authorities figured out a loss to the municipality and finally a corporation, securing control of the mayor and council, obtained a lease of the city's plant. The Telegraph Herald says:

"All signs point to a job between the mayor and the council on one hand and the lighting corporation on the other. The people are denouncing the deal and have secured a writ of injunction in estoppel and will attack the validity of lease and contract. Even with the very bad management that attended it, Elgin's municipal plant would have earned a profit if allowance had been made on the debit side of the ledger for lighting the streets, the parks and the public buildings. But the mayor and council would make no such allowance. The reason becomes apparent in the light of their recent action. The game pulled off the other day has been in preparation a long time."

It is no argument against municipal ownership that the experiment failed through maladministration. We hear frequently of bank failures and republican newspapers often take great pains to show that the failure was due to the dishonesty or incompetency of some of the bank's officials. The Burlington Hawkeye would very quickly protest if anyone should undertake to use these bank failures as an argument against the system.

WHY NOT, OF COURSE?

The Kansas City Star says: "That the railways, willingly or unwillingly, are subservient to the dictation of the Standard Oil company is shown in a single example of rate making. Before the Standard's pipeline from the Kansas fields to Kansas City was completed, and the Standard depended on the railways to carry its oil, the rate was ten cents per 100 pounds, reckoning four pounds to the gallon. When the pipeline was opened, instead of lowering the rate to meet competition, the railroads advanced the oil rate to seventeen cents per hundred, reckoning seven pounds to the gallon. This increase made the rate within a small fraction of three times as large as it was when the railways were serving the Standard Oil Company. In other words, as soon as the Standard had its pipeline established, the railroads made such a rate as would force the producers to sell to the Oil trust instead of shipping by rail to independent refineries or to other users of crude oil."

The Chicago Tribune, commenting on this condition, makes the interesting point that if the railroads, ordered by a rate commission to charge a lower rate than the roads can afford, are permitted to secure an injunction against the enforcement of such a rate, why are not shippers permitted to secure injunction against the railroads for charging rates so excessive as to amount to spoliation?

Referring to the comment by the Chicago Tribune, the Star says: "The point is well taken and it ought to be considered by the oil shippers of Kansas."

Undoubtedly the point has been considered by the oil shippers of Kansas, just as the same