

Georgia charging more than just and reasonable rates for the transportation of freight and passengers."

"The method heretofore adopted for carrying out this command has been through the instrumentality of a railroad commission. This commission is charged with the duty of securing for the people of the state reasonable and just freight and passenger rates."

"It stands as the machinery provided by law to protect the public against oppression by the transportation companies. If the members of the commission do not discharge the duty imposed upon them, they fail to protect the interests of the public, and should resign or be removed. Their reasons are immaterial. Personal considerations cannot be admitted. The public welfare must not wait on formality. The people of Georgia are entitled to just rates from the carriers, and no rates can be just that are higher than the rates granted to people in surrounding states under similar conditions."

"We demand an immediate leveling of interstate rates to the basis of yielding no more than a reasonable return upon the money invested; and the abolishment of all discriminations against the people of this state, in favor of the people of other states."

"We demand that the railroad commission of Georgia shall take immediate action upon these important matters, so as to place the shippers and consumers of this state upon an equal footing with their competitors elsewhere."

"We condemn these excessive and discriminating port rates as unjust, and we demand the immediate righting of these wrongs by the railroad commission. If the commission fails to carry out our demands, we call upon the executive and legislative departments of the government to use their utmost authority to bring about a proper reduction of rates to and from the ports to the interior, as well as rates within the state."

"We favor increasing the powers of the commission to such an extent that it can enforce its orders by suitable, swift and certain procedure. We also favor the enactment of such laws as will make the willful refusal of railroad corporations or any of their agents to obey the orders of the commission a penal offense, to be punished by fine or imprisonment, or both."

It will be noticed that the platform says: "No man can serve two masters with equal fidelity to both. Those men who elect to represent special interests and owe their first fealty to them, do not deserve, and ought not to hold, party positions of dignity, influence and power. The party machinery and the government, state and national, should be completely purged of such men." This platform was adopted at Macon, Ga., on September 4 of last year. It was the same day, September 4, that Mr. Bryan in a speech before the Jefferson club at Chicago presented the same doctrine and pointed out that men who, like Mr. Sullivan, the democratic national committeeman from Illinois, represent corporate interests, could not faithfully represent the people also. It would seem, therefore, that Mr. Bryan was entirely in harmony with the democracy of Georgia in what he said on this subject, and if it will not offend the Wall street organs, it is here predicted that when the democrats of the nation have a chance to express themselves on this subject, they will be found to agree. It will be found that they also recognize the Bible doctrine that no man can serve two masters. The Georgia democracy is conservative in the sense that it would remedy existing abuses by the application of old time principles, but it is not conservative in the sense in which the Wall street papers use the term. The southern democrats are democratic, and any attempt to misrepresent their sincere devotion to a positive and aggressive democratic doctrine will be rebuked when they have a chance to speak through their primaries.

A GOOD PLATFORM

Ex-Congressman Stephenson of Wisconsin has announced himself as a candidate for the United States senate on the following platform:

1. Prompt and thorough revision of all tariff schedules, reducing duties wherever possible without reducing wages of labor.
2. Strengthening the interstate commerce law, giving the commission full power to regulate rates and services.
3. Legislation authorizing and equipping the interstate commerce commission to ascertain the true value of railway property, the cost of operating the railways and the amount paid therefor.
4. Legislation requiring the adoption of the best known safety appliances and prescribing strict regulations in the operations of trains in connection therewith.
5. Strengthening the Sherman anti-trust law and imposing such additional penalties as will

deter property interests from combining in violation thereof.

6. A constitutional amendment for the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people.

7. A federal tax upon incomes.

8. A federal tax upon inheritance, the same not to interfere with the taxation of inheritances under the Wisconsin state law.

9. An effective child labor law.

10. Legislation prohibiting the sale or entry of any public lands containing coal, lignite, oil or gas, and providing that the government should retain its title and lease such lands under terms which will enable the government to prevent combination and maintain reasonable prices.

11. I am opposed to ship subsidy and to all other forms of direct government bounty. It is wrong in principle and increases the danger of special privilege, already a menace to a government of equal rights for all.

12. I am a republican and shall expect to act with my party generally on all matters of public policy, reserving to myself the right to vote my conscientious judgment at all times. I shall continue to aid loyally the cause of reform in Wisconsin, the beneficent results of which the people of this commonwealth now freely acknowledge.

That is a pretty good platform for a republican. Wonder how many planks of that platform will find their way into the next republican national platform? To understand the split in the republican party between the reformers and the standpatters, just read this Stephenson platform and compare it with the speeches of the big republicans in the senate.



PRESIDENT DEFENDS SUBSIDY

President Roosevelt has written a letter addressed to Congressman Pollard of the First Nebraska district, commending him for his support of the ship subsidy bill. The president's letter to Mr. Pollard is evidently one of a number of letters sent to western members who supported the ship subsidy, and it is evident that the president in this letter intended to state for publication his reasons for favoring the ship subsidy. It is evident that he intends to bring this matter up before congress again and therefore it is worth while for the people to be considering the subject.

It is not likely that the bill can pass the house of representatives at the next session because the republican majority is only about half as large in the present congress as in the last congress. Even in the last congress forty-one republicans voted against the ship subsidy when reduced to its lowest figures, and if anything like that number of republicans oppose the subsidy in the next congress, it has no chance of passage. It must be remembered also that these forty-one republicans voted against the bill at the second session—the session held after the election when all of the jobs are pushed to the front. It might well be asked why the president did not urge this measure during the long session when there was more time for its consideration and when the people could sit in judgment upon it at the election. Instead of urging it then, the president waited until after the election and then attempted to secure the passage of the bill. If he could not succeed at a short session, he is hardly likely to succeed when the members have before them the fear of a coming election.

The president is in favor of closer communication between North and South America. Very good. So are all the people regardless of party, but how can we cultivate more intimate relations with South America? Can we do it by subsidizing ships to bring South American products to our port and then shut out those products by a high tariff wall? There is something absurd in all this talk of encouraging foreign commerce when we deliberately exclude so many articles of commerce from our markets by prohibitive tariffs.

It is also absurd to protect a few ship-builders by laws which prohibit the purchase of foreign ships and then tax the whole public to compensate the ship-owners for the burdens placed upon them in the interest of the ship-builders.

There are three objections to a ship subsidy, first—that it is unfair to the mass of the people to single out a few steamship lines for favoritism and to tax the rest of the people for the benefit of these few; second—because a subsidy once granted, could not be withdrawn. If our experience in this matter was similar to our experience in tariff matters, we would find it necessary to increase the subsidy from time to time. It requires a higher tariff now to protect adult industries which export in competition with the world than we asked for the encouragement of these industries when infants; third—the ship subsidy plan is not the best plan of establishing more intimate commercial relations with South America.

The Commoner suggested several years ago that some of the money now being put into warships ought to be put into transports and these transports used in time of peace for the establishment of desirable lines of traffic. If the American people can afford to pay a subsidy to ship-owners in order to establish lines of communication between our coast and South America, they can afford to establish these lines themselves and use their own ships. They could either operate these vessels themselves and use them for the training of seamen as well as for the promotion of commerce, or they could lease the vessels to ship companies on conditions that would establish the lines where lines are wanted and limit the profits of the company to a certain percentage. If the government establishes its own lines, the people get what they pay for and the lines can be suspended whenever they are found unprofitable. If lines are subsidized the expense is likely to be far in excess of the advantage, and it is difficult, if not impossible, to withdraw the support.

The president has gained popularity by advocating certain democratic doctrines, but he has gained no popularity by his advocacy of a ship subsidy, which is not only not democratic but is opposed by a very large and respected element of the republican party. If the republican congressmen who voted against the ship subsidy represent their constituents, it is apparent that less than half of the members of the republican party favor the ship subsidy.

The president's position on the ship subsidy is inconsistent with his position on the railroad question, on the trust question, and on the income tax, and he will find that he only weakens his power to do good by his attempt to help a few ship-owners to reach their hands into the public treasury.



ELECTION ECHOES

Treasurer Bliss of the republican national committee still sits on the committee's books and maintains a discreet silence.

Up to date, however, it has not been officially denied that Mr. Harriman raised the \$200,000 and saved New York to the g. o. p.

The gentlemen who are so loudly insisting that a five million dollar combine has been formed to defeat President Roosevelt are the same gentlemen who grew so wroth when it was remarked that a greater financial combine corrupted the electorate in 1896. The ownership of the ox continues to cut a marked figure.

Mr. Perkins put it back and Mr. Harriman says he contributed \$50,000. This, too, after Mr. Roosevelt hotly denied the truth of Judge Parker's statement. The republican national committee got the money, and it came from just the sources that Judge Parker pointed out. This is the inexorable truth of history.



DOLLAR FOR A DEAR HEART

She was ready for sleep as she lay on my arm
In her little frilled cap so fine,
With her golden hair falling out at the edge,
Like a circle of noon sunshine;
And I hummed the old tune of "Banbury Cross,"
And "Three Men Who Put Out to Sea,"
When she sleepily said, as she closed her blue eyes:
"Papa, what would you take for me?"

And I answered, "A dollar, dear little heart,"
And she slept, baby, weary with play,
But I held her warm in my love-strong arms,
And I rocked her, and rocked away,
Oh, the dollar meant all the world to me,
The land, the sea and the sky,
The lowest depth of the lowest place,
The highest of all that's high.

All the cities with streets and palaces,
With their people and stores of art,
I would not take for one low soft throb
Of my little one's loving heart;
Nor all the gold that was ever found
In the busy wealth-finding past,
Would I take for one smile of my darling's face,
Did I know it must be the last.

So I rocked my baby, and rocked away,
And I felt such a sweet content,
For the words of the song expressed more to me
Than they ever before had meant,
And the night crept on, and I slept and dreamed
Of things far too glad to be,
And I waked with lips saying close to my ear,
"Papa, what would you take for me?"

—Eugene Field.