the "boss" in the house, and Aldrich is the "boss" in the senate?

Is he a member of their party?

Do they represent him and his party or does he represent them and their party? Does he stand for and represent the party that they and their corporation followers control?

Of course a demagogic answer, sounding in clap-trap phrases to arouse applause, may be given, but one does not willingly associate the word coward with any defense of Theodore Roosevelt.

Does he represent the party whose leaders, organization, influence and power—professedly representing the incorporated and organized wealth of the country—have successfully opposed him to an extent that, strive as he has, his administration has effected absolutely nothing of benefit to the people or the country.

If he is a republican, what is Harriman? What is Morgan, Rogers, Armour, Elkins, Foraker, Aldrich, Addicks, Rockefeller? These men and their associates and followers absolutely dominate the republican party in congress, and that party has been the constant and successful opponent to the administration of Theodore Roosevelt.

If he is a republican, what does he represent, with the railroads and Standard Oil, that he is prosecuting, in absolute and unconditional control (Aldrich and "Uncle Joe") of the republican party? W. S. RYAN.

Indianapolis, Ind.

Washington Letter

Washington, D. C., August 26.—After Mr. Root, long time attorney for Thomas F. Ryan, and men of that type, and Mr. Bacon, assistant secretary of state, but long time partner of J. Pierpont Morgan, and Mr. Taft, whose brother controls the public service corporations of Cincinnati and a few other men of like type and like interests had visited the president at Oyster Bay, Wall Street cheered up and prices went up. What does it all mean? Mr. Root and Mr. Bacon have denied strenuously that they visited Wall Street. We must take their denial as expressing the truth. But it is rather strange that when all "values" in Wall Street were going down the mere fact that Root and Bacon—the corporation lawyer and the banking partner—were closeted with the president, made values go up. And curiously enough the news came out coincidently with their visit to Oyster Bay that the useful and servile Cortelyou was about to come to the rescue of the New York banks. The New York banks have to be rescued by the treasury department about four times a year. They are always distressed about the administration at Washington, but every time they get into trouble they go pleading to it for aid. Mr. Cortelyou now has determined to release some part of the $87,000,000 surplus now in the treasury in order that the banks may furnish money to move the crops.

Secretary Cortelyou could do no less. But the party to which he gives his adherence might have done much more. It might have refrained from taxing the people who raised the crops and the people who will buy the wheat and corn, for moving which this money is needed so highly as to pile up $87,000,000 uselessly in the treasury. It might have so handled the banking and currency problem that the national banks would not be able to say to the government on the one hand, "Lend us your money at no interest," and to the farmer on the other hand, "If the government will supply us with funds we will lend it to you to move your crops at from eight to ten per cent interest." The problem of the relation of the people to the banks and the banks to the government has not yet been solved.

A New York newspaper which has only supported a democratic candidate once in the last twelve years, and suffered the ignominy of seeing that candidate beaten more cruelly than anyone since Greeley, has been asking "What is a democrat?" It has had plenty of answers, but never mind what they were. The republican party is about to be confronted with the proposition, "What is a standpatter?"

Excepting Governor Cummins, of Iowa, and LaFollette, of Wisconsin, there are no statesmen in the republican ranks who are frankly for immediate tariff revision and for revision downward. Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, who announces himself as the president's dearest friend, says that there must be revision in time, but he does not think that the next congress—the Sixtieth—should undertake it. Speaker Cannon drifts into Washington in the dull season and in his patronizing way says to the newspaper men who interview him: "My boy, we must revise the tariff, but not until after the next presidential election." Secretary Taft, the president's candidate for the presidential nomination, goes about saying that a revision of the tariff is bound to come, but not until after the presidential election. How curious it is that all these men, and we have mentioned only three out of the sixty who might be named, admit the necessity for tariff revision, but each one insists that it shall not be even discussed in the next congress. Now why? Is it barely possible that their desire for campaign contributions to be used in the next presidential election makes them unwilling to offend or affront the protected industries. If tariff revision is necessary, why not do it now? Why not effect it now? In the Sixtieth congress Mr. Roosevelt, an old time low tariff man, will have back of him the senate and the house. If there is any honesty or integrity of purpose on his part, or on the part of his political associates and proteges, this is the time for him to revise the tariff and to revise it downward. If he purposes to allow his friend Lodge, his legatee Taft, his sycophantes Burton, Parsons, Warner and the rest to go about the country preaching tariff reform to be accomplished after his retirement from office, he must expect that the people of the country will recognize in his attitude merely a cowardly evasion of an issue which he and his lieutenants dare not meet at the polls.

The complaint made by some spokesmen of the railroads against the laws enacted in certain southern states fixing the relative power of the state and the federal court is unjustified, but demands some attention.

These laws provide that when a railroad transfers a case from a state to a federal court its license to do business in the state is thereby revoked. Within a few weeks the enforcement of a law of this sort has caused a clash in North Carolina, Alabama and Arkansas.

In the north the erroneous impression seems to be held that the law forbids the railroads to appeal to the federal courts. Nothing could be further from the truth. What the states condemn, and rightly, is the notorious and unfair tactics of railroad corporations of transferring civil cases to the federal courts in the first instance, without waiting for a decision from a state court. Aside from the discourtesy to the state implied by this practice the proper course under the law and directed by both state and federal statutes is to carry the case first through the state court, appealing from the lower to the higher, and then in the last instance to take it to the United States supreme court. That court remains the court of last resort. Its dignity, its authority and its justice are questioned by no one. It is open to any litigant who has carried his case through the subordinate tribunals. If the railroads would abide by this fair and proper practice, there would be no trouble. The federal courts are merely appellate in nature and only after a decision by the highest state courts can the federal courts be invoked to pass upon the issues involved. This is the law, and it is futile, unfair and impolitic for any railroad to attempt to evade it by a resort to the federal courts in the first instance.

The right of a state to revoke a license of a corporation that ignores the state courts and appeals in the first instance to the federal courts, has been passed upon four times by the United States supreme court. True, that distinguished tribunal with consistent inconsistency has reversed itself twice on this subject, as it reversed itself once on the income tax, and as in its long career it has reversed itself on almost every subject submitted to its learned adjudication. In the early seventies Wisconsin enacted a law requiring foreign corporations to agree not to remove suits against them to the federal courts. That was Wisconsin. Just now states in that immediate neighborhood look upon the action of the southern states in doing the same thing as a sort of relic of nullification and secession. But the supreme court declared that law unconstitutional. The sovereign state of Wisconsin thereupon passed another law providing licenses for foreign corporations with a forfeiture of the license in the event that the corporation removed civil cases to the federal courts. This was upheld by the supreme court.

In April, 1887, the supreme court declared a somewhat similar, but possibly too drastic act passed by the Iowa legislature unconstitutional. Its latest decision in May of last year upheld a Kentucky law of like tenure on the ground that "as a state has power to refuse permission to a foreign corporation to do business at all within its confines, and as it has power to withdraw that permission when once given without stating any reason for its action, the fact that it may give what some may think a poor reason, or none, for a valid act, is immaterial."

That is the law. Curiously enough that law was built up as much by the action of northern states as by that of the southern states now appealing to it.

WILLIS J. ABBOTT.

Special Offer

Each of the following persons have sent in five yearly subscriptions to The Commoner as follows: A. I. Forgey, Galveston, Ind.; M. C. Peltier, Fruitland, Wash.; Levi Moyer, Edinburg, Ind.; D. W. ..oush, Preston, Kan.; Thomas Jones, Hurdland, Mo.; William Carter, Malcolm, Ala.; W. E. McClure, Irwin, Mo.; M. B. McMannus, Macksburg, O.; R. T. Mayo, Claflin, Kan.; A. H. Covert, New York, N. Y.; J. H. McAnnis, Cleveland, Tenn.; W. C. Fee, Ewing, Mo.; E. T. Figgins, Dover, Ky.; W. L. Lawhorn, Fate, Tex.; J. M. Creel, Dix, Ill.; Dr. Lloyd Ackley, Cansville, N. Y.; Captain L. C. Reeve, Rome, O.; J. W. Harrington, Wautoma, Wis.; C. W. Bachelder, Cloverdale, Ind.; W. W. Hill, Apollo, Pa.; William Harley, Sr., Millgrove, Ind.; John McNicol, Hillsboro, O.; A. H. Clark, Sullivan, Mo.; M. P. Heasley, Franklin, Pa.; Frank J. Dietrich, Granville, Ia.; Dock Rose, Curryville, Mo.; A Friend, Belleville, Ill.; J. F. Mahoney, Bellevue, Pa.; William H. Rouse, Wichita, Kan.; J. C. Beresford, Boston, Pa.; Dr. George W. Thompson, New York, N. Y.; L. A. Cochrane, Davenport, Okla.; John T. Tansey, Albany, N. Y.; Harry Morris, Sulphur, Ky.; W. H. Ogilvie, Berlin, Wis.; Andrew Dutton, White Cloud, Kan.; G. P. Williams, Hinsdale, N. Y., Frank Schaibley, LaFayette, Ind.; R. M. Chappell, Otia, Ky.; Nathaniel Greer, Pittsburg, Pa.; P. G. Cunningham, Walton, W. Va.; R. A. Manchester, Canfield, O.; L. H. Jarvis, Brooklyn, N. Y.; A. J. Moore, Wilson, Kan.; John I. Keech, Spry, Pa.; R. M. Parsons, Hydesville, Cal.; Joseph Bule, Hillsboro, Texas; J. A. Gaines, Westmoreland, Tenn.; E. P. Hawkins, Amsterdam, Mo.; Charles Lundquist, Sunfield, Mich.; A. D. Mattison, Adams Basin, N. Y.; George W. Banta, Felix, N. M.; August Schumacher, Rhineland, Texas; Joseph Snyder, Pendleton, Ore.; William H. Rouse, Wichita, Kan.; M. P. Funk, Ludlow, Ill.; W. P. Allen, Matthews, Ind.; Anson Storm, Plainfield, Wis.; C. S. Shippy, Hope, N. D.; M. A. Thompson, Headrick, Okla.; Henry A. Drumm, Boulder, Colo.; L. N. Spencer, Lancaster, Pa.

Everyone who approves the work The Commoner is doing is invited to co-operate along the lines of the special subscription offer. According to the terms of this offer cards each good for one year's subscription to The Commoner will be furnished in lots of five at the rate of $3 per lot. This places the yearly subscription rate at 60 cents.

Any one ordering these cards may sell them for $1 each, thus earning a commission of $2 on each lot sold, or he may sell them at the cost price and find compensation in the fact that he has contributed to the educational campaign.

These cards may be paid for when ordered, or they may be ordered and remittance made after they have been sold. A coupon is printed below for the convenience of those who desire to participate in this effort to increase The Commoner's circulation:

The Commoner's Special Offer

Application for Subscription Cards

5	
10	
15	
20	
25	
50	
75	
100	

Publisher COMMONER: I am interested in increasing THE COMMONER'S circulation, and desire you to send me a supply of subscription cards. I agree to use my utmost endeavor to sell the cards, and will remit for them at the rate of 60 cents each, when sold.

.....

BOX OR STREET NO. .....

P. O. ..... STATE .....

Indicate the number of cards wanted by marking X opposite one of the numbers printed on end of this blank.

If you believe the paper is doing a work that merits encouragement, fill out the above coupon and mail it to **The Commoner, Lincoln, Neb.**