

heading, "The Wage Worker's Share," it goes on to speak of reckless assertions and figures which will not stand analysis. It quotes from the Master Printer and says: "The total selling value of the manufacturer's products in the United States in the census year was \$13,014,287,498. The cost of raw material, of which many million dollars' worth was imported and therefore not produced by American workmen, was \$7,348,144,755." It occurred to me that this statement was somewhat reckless. I have before me Census Bulletin No. 150, entitled "Manufactures." Table No. 2 gives these facts: Cost of materials, total, \$7,377,907,079. The items of these materials are, purchased in raw state, \$2,395,958,161; purchased partially manufactured, \$4,658,697,841; fuel, freight, etc., \$323,251,077; value of products, \$13,091,876,790. Table No. 1 gives wages of officials, clerks, etc., at \$404,837,591; wageearners' total wages \$2,320,273,021. If the census increased them to \$2,395,958,161 worth of raw material they add \$2,725,110,612 paid for labor and sell the output for \$13,091,876,790. Their other expenses as shown by the census are: Miscellaneous, \$1,031,654,325; fuel, lights and freight, \$323,251,077, leaving a balance of over six billion dollars. Again, what is labor's share after allowing a fair return, say 5 per cent, on the capital invested in the plant? I do not think the operator should have it all. I do think by reducing the tariff to a point when our factories are compelled to compete with the world it would force them to pay better prices for raw material and reduce the price of finished product to the consumer, giving all labor better remuneration and producing fewer Carnegies.

J. C. Cuppy, Pittsburg, Pa.—I note in The Commoner recently an ably written article by Orwell C. Riddle of Columbus, Ohio, in which he among other things, said: "In The Commoner of February 22 was an excellent communication from Joseph H. Call of Los Angeles, Cal., on the subject of 'The Treaty Power.' In the last three paragraphs of his letter there is one sentence to which the writer desires to note an exception; the particular sentence reads: "A valid treaty is, of course, a law of the United States, and can change or amend any other existing law, whether made by the two houses or in the form of a treaty." Subsequent to citing article 6, section 2, of the United States Constitution, Mr. Riddle further said: "The president's collusion with the senate as a precedent over the constitution and statutes is the highest degree of autocratic monarchy." During the close of the national campaign of 1900, it was stoutly contended that the absence of the Chinese exclusion plank in the national republican platform meant nothing, in that the treaty with China was the supreme law of the land and said treaty did not expire during the life of the congress then to be elected. However, the act of congress excluding the Chinese race, in force at that time, expired during the life of the congress then to be elected, which made a debatable question: "Was the Chinese exclusion plank left out of the republican platform of 1900 through an oversight?" As a student on this question during the early Knights of Labor crusade, I was called upon by the press only a few weeks prior to the close of that campaign for an interview in which I cited several federal court decisions holding that "a treaty is not mandatory, it is only permissive and has no legislative force." A reproduction of this aforesaid interview would forever settle the controversy, and as I verily believe, the solution of this vexing problem therein suggested would provide ways and means for constitutionally closing the flood-gate of foreign immigration to all of the undesirable of the five races of men. I would be derelict in not calling special attention to the fact that a legislative act giving force beyond the period of expiration of the treaty permitting such legislation would be unconstitutional in that it was not uniform in its application during the period of no permission given. There is a practical solution for every paramount issue; compromise measures will be no longer tolerated. The people are tired of being "fooled all of the time" by their mis-representatives in congress, the executive and judiciary; if they will not listen to "Reason," she will surely rap their knuckles.

I. A. Waters, Springfield, Ohio.—Now that there is a little agitation about curtailing railroad earnings we see the railway interests publishing broadcast statements that they can not borrow more money to furnish new equipment, etc. And they are even threatening to raise freight rates. Is the press of this country going

to allow the public to be deluded by such stuff? The years 1903, 1904 and 1905 were banner years in railway earnings, yet 1906 outstripped all former years enormously. Why not show the people that extensions, equipments, etc., should be made out of earnings, even if the dividends on the \$8,000,000,000 of railway watered stock shall be reduced. Is it right that the people should continue indefinitely to contribute \$300,000,000 a year to paying dividends on stock which should never have been issued? The press is allowing this point to go unchallenged. Was it not the intention of the rate bill to give the people some relief from exorbitant freight rates? It has not done it. It has added millions to the income of railways by the elimination of rebates, but the mass of the people have profited nothing by it, and we never challenge the right of railways to go on issuing stock and insisting that freight rates must be kept high enough to pay dividends on whatever amount they put out. Think of it! Three hundred millions a year wrongfully taken from the people! This amount would build and equip a double track railroad from New York to the Pacific coast which, operated by the government, would be worth infinitely more to the United States than the Panama canal. One trans-continental government railroad could be made a great regulator of freight rates. The main point I am trying to make is that freight rates should be reduced even if it cuts dividends which the people are unjustly compelled to pay to the extent of \$300,000,000 a year.

A Traveling Man, Grand Forks, N. D.—Why does it cost \$150,000 more a year to keep up the White House with Roosevelt there than any other president? Did not Roosevelt go outside of his jurisdiction when he called Moyer and Haywood undesirable citizens, as well as when he said states had no right to legislate on railroads? Does the constitution of the United States give the right of every state to legislate on railroads or not? Did not the president violate his oath of office when he said that state had no right to legislate on railroads? Has the president appointed anyone to an office that was not boosted by railroads or trusts? Was not Root, secretary of state, J. P. Morgan's head counsel? Was not Bacon, assistant secretary of state a hired man of J. P. Morgan? Did not Roosevelt send out Root to denounce W. R. Hearst as the assassin of William McKinley? Has any other president been guilty of calling citizens liars or undesirable citizens just because they did not agree with the president? Has not every man that the president called liars been vindicated, including Parker, Harriman, Chandler, Storrer and Bigelow? Why does the president boost for the ship subsidy bill? Does he not know that this bill takes \$180,000,000 out of the United States treasury in nine years and donates to such men as Morgan, Schwab and others? Why does the president only appoint railroad tools to have charge of digging the Panama canal? Why does he allow such conditions to exist in the Panama canal zone as is reported when he has absolute charge of the work? Did not the United States senate add \$25,000 to the president's salary, and called it traveling expenses just after the railroad rate bill was passed with an unlimited court review? Is not Roosevelt the most expensive president by \$175,000 we have ever had?

G. W. Demaree, Christiansburg, Ky.—As a reader of The Commoner, I have noticed that The Commoner, unlike most newspapers, does not evade the responsibility of publishing some things regarded as being "serious" by the worldly minded. Therefore I wish to call attention through The Commoner to some marvelous things that are going on in the world, at this time—this period of wonderful blindness. There never has been a time in the world's history—and I appeal to the best historians—when the world powers were making such gigantic preparations for war as at the present time. There never was a time when so many soldiers in proportion to the population of the world in time of peace, were ready at command to murder, and destroy the peace of the earth. There never was a time when greater war ships with their destructive implements of death, moved so menacingly upon the great deep as now. Great factories are turning out death dealing implements of war, military schools all over the so-called civilized world teaching the young the art of pomp and murder, and in plain view of this heartless greed for battle, the hypocritical cry of "peace, peace," rings out from The Hague tribunal, from the oratorical platform, and even the dear lovers of the clash of the battle and

the groans of the dying echo back the pointed cry of "peace and safety." What can all these things mean if not the condition of things foreseen by the Apostle Paul over eighteen hundred years ago, as recorded in his first epistle to the Thessalonians, fifth chapter, which reads in part: "But of the times and seasons brethren ye have no need that I write unto you, for yourselves know perfectly, that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. For when they shall say peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them"—"and they shall not escape." "But ye brethren are not in darkness that that day should overtake you as a thief." Who are the "they" alluded to by the apostle, if not the world powers who blindly cry "peace, peace, when there is no peace?" It would seem that in the days of the apostle there was a remnant of the human race represented in the passage by the "Ye Brethren," that were "not in darkness." And so in the present day there are a few people who obey the warning, "What I say unto you, I say unto all, watch." Mark 13:37. And these few people guided by the "light," from prophetic scriptures, are able to see that the "destruction" of the Gentile (Beastly, Dan. 7:) powers is not far ahead.

John O'Toole, Alliance, Ohio.—The recent or present American-Japanese trouble is only the recurrence of like events since the dawn of time on the division of human beings into races. Civilization and education may allay race prejudices, but up to this time their influences have never been able to totally remove them. No two separate races have ever bumped elbows in one country on one location and preserved the peace very long. Nor is it likely that they ever will while employment be considered as a favor and the different races come into competition with each other. Instead of one race problem in this country we now have two, and if some legislation does not soon prevent it we may have more. The writer suggests the adoption by congress of a resolution and the making of it effective, declaring hostility of the United States towards the immigration of all persons not of the Caucasian race excepting, of course, tourists, scholars, etc.

NEBRASKA DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

The democratic state convention for Nebraska met at Lincoln September 24. P. E. McKillip was chosen chairman of the convention, W. H. Thompson was chairman of the resolutions committee, and T. S. Allen was re-elected chairman of the state committee. The convention declared in favor of a special session of the legislature to deal with the railroad rate question.

The platform as it relates to national questions will be found on another page of this issue. On local questions the resolutions were as follows:

Undoubtedly the railroad commission which was created by an amendment to the constitution has no power to fix rates, therefore we demand that the governor shall call an extra session of the legislature and that that body shall establish maximum rates upon grain, live stock, fruit, vegetables, building material, fuel, and such kindred products as enter into the necessities of life. Also a stringent anti-pass law, a reciprocal demurrage law, and a law directing the governor of this state to appoint a competent commission of at least five, no more than two of whom shall be of one political party, who shall after due investigation report upon the physical values and the market values of all common carriers doing business within the state for the guidance of the legislature and the taxing powers.

Believing that the writ of injunction has been prostituted from its original purpose until it is now, to all intents and purposes, a weapon in the hands of capitalistic combines for the terrorizing and enslavement of organized workmen, we pledge our best efforts for the enactment of a law that will safeguard the rights of the wage earners by providing for trial by jury in all cases of contempt not arising in open court.

We recognize that the highest court of this state should be composed of men who are able, honest, conscientious, and free from the control of any selfish interest and we, therefore, heartily endorse the candidacy of George L. Loomis for the office of supreme judge and we commend him to the voters of Nebraska. We also endorse and commend the candidacy of John L. Sundeau and R. J. Millard for the offices of regents of the state university.