

side whether he will make his fight as a republican or as a democrat.

The Commoner commends this subject to the earnest consideration of the young men who, inspired by high ideals, are about to take their place in the forefront of that army which must win the civil victories of our nation.

Let them remember, first, that the doctrine that the state had a right to secede was a doctrine that had supporters in all parts of the United States—supporters who conscientiously believed that the constitution meant that—and let these young men not forget that that question has been settled and can never arise again.

Let them remember also that the sin of slavery was a national sin, not a sectional one, and that it was not only recognized in the constitution, but that it was supported by many conscientious people north and south. But slavery has been abolished and abolished forever. Neither the question of national unity nor the question of slavery can again disturb the nation.

Third, Let them remember that upon the issues which are now before the country, the democratic party is on the people's side; it is easier to make the democratic party an effective instrument for the protection of the public weal and the advancement of public good than it is to reform the republican party or to create a new party strong enough to be effective.

STILL AT SEA

The senate voted down Senator Stone's resolution, promising Philippine independence at the end of fifteen years. The resolution was defeated by practically a party vote, showing that the republicans are still at sea as to their policy in the Philippines. No republican senator would dare to propose a resolution announcing a definite policy—the republican party has no policy. The country is left to rest under the charge of having abandoned the principles of self government and yet no prominent republican would risk a vote on a platform declaring for a permanent colonial policy.

The democratic party has a plan and it has consistently urged that plan from the beginning, namely, that we make an immediate promise of ultimate independence. There may be room for discussion as to whether the promise should fix a definite time, as the Stone resolution did, or leave the time indefinite, but the time is not so important as the declaration of a policy. Senator Stone is to be commended for presenting the issue and the party is to be congratulated upon the unanimity shown in the support of the resolution.

Drop a line to the democratic senators and members who voted to tax lumber and iron ore and tell them what you think of their votes. A few thousand letters or postals may give them some idea of the injury they have done the party.

TO SHUNT OFF INCOME TAX

The weekly financial letter sent out by the Wall Street broker is, as a rule, brutally frank. In the letter issued by Bache & Co., under date of June 19, this interesting statement is made: "It is useless to discuss the practicability of this measure of taxing net earnings, as the question of what are real net earnings is one that it would be practically impossible to establish in a manufacturing business. It must be regarded as a political move to shunt off the income tax advocates for the time being."

Bache & Co. have probably described the situation. The plan proposed by Messrs. Aldrich and Taft is intended to shunt off the income tax. Even though it is successful at this time it will only be "for the time being."

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT

President Taft has recommended the submission of a constitutional amendment authorizing the collection of an income tax and every democratic senator and member ought to vote for it. The last democratic national platform says:

"We favor an income tax as part of our revenue system, and we urge the submission of a constitutional amendment specifically authorizing congress to levy and collect tax upon individual and corporate incomes, to the end that

wealth may bear its proportionate share of the burdens of the federal government."

It is a question whether any income tax law can be so drawn as to meet the approval of the supreme court if the court is disposed to follow the last decision on the subject, but whatever the chances may be we ought to have a constitutional amendment specifically authorizing congress to collect such a tax. Now is the time to secure it. With a republican administration back of it and the democratic party for it there ought to be no doubt of the submission and the ratification of the amendment. The submission of the amendment need not prevent the passage of an income tax law; in fact it would be well to follow up the submission of the amendment with an income tax law, but the advocates of the income tax law ought not to allow their advocacy of that to prevent their giving hearty support to the amendment. President Taft's plan of taxing the net incomes of corporations can be added to the Bailey-Cummins measure.

The democrats can well afford to favor all these plans. It is not necessary to choose between them.

ALDRICH!

Henry Watterson in the Louisville Courier-Journal:

The one thing in the senate which has filled us with admiration is Aldrich. "Och!" says Bridget Ann O'Reilly in the Irish comedy, referring to Sir Patrick O'Plenipo—"the cheek of him!" Yea, verily, both the hide and cheek and the gall of Aldrich, and clad in iron, steel and brass; carrying a forked hook and a shining spear; why, Senator Dillworthy, his motto, "the old flag and an appropriation," was nothing to Aldrich; old sugar-in-the-gourd but a boy in corduroys compared with Aldrich; Ephraim Smooth, himself the merest tyro at the game of now-you-see-it and now-you-don't; and fitly the poet says:

"High on a throne of loot and graft which far outshines the wealth of Ormus and of Inde, Of Carnegie and Rockefeller, E'en Standard Oil and Federal Steel, Aldrich exalted sits by merit raised To that proud eminence"

Whilst the imps of the system hang round the doors and cry, "May the devil admire him!" Subsidy herself kow-tows to Aldrich. Goetz of the Iron Hand never hooked and hauled in the rafters on the Rhine with more coolness and dexterity than the senator from Rhode Island has ransacked and rifled the cargoes of honest, merchandise seeking to navigate protectionist waters, to avoid the shoals of classification and round the headlands of the schedules.

WORDS WORTH REMEMBERING

"Better no revision at all, better that the new bill should fail, unless we have an honest and thorough revision on the basis laid down and the principles outlined in the party's platform."—President Taft to the Ohio Society last December.

"The Dingley tariff has served the country well, but its rates have become generally excessive. They have become excessive because conditions have changed since its passage in 1896. Some of the rates are probably too low, due also to the change of conditions. But, on the whole, the tariff ought to be lowered."—Mr. Taft at Cincinnati on September 22 last.

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

The New York Times is authority for the statement that the surety banks have increased their rates from \$2.50 a thousand to \$5.00 a thousand for insuring the deposit of state funds. Does this mean that the banks are not as secure as they were, or are the surety banks attempting to double their profits. As a result of the increase the banking department and the state bankers' associations of New York approved a bill to permit savings bank bonds to be used in lieu of surety bank bonds.

KEEPING BONDS AT HOME

Mayor Carleson of Jamestown, N. Y., is urging upon his citizens the policy of issuing bonds in small denominations, when bonds have to be issued, with the idea of encouraging the

purchase of bonds by the people in the city. This plan is certainly a wise one, and the only objection to it is that it does not please the high financiers. The Wall Street magnates endeavor to create the impression that no bonds can be sold until they are underwritten at a nice profit by some prominent New York firm. There is no reason, however, why the people of a city should not buy and hold the bonds which are issued for improvements. The city bond is a most excellent form of investment, and there is no reason why the denomination of the bonds should not be small enough to permit the holding of them by the industrial masses. The only difference between a bond and a savings bank account is that the money in the savings bank can be withdrawn upon giving the required notice, while bonds run for several years. This, however, can be, to a certain extent, remedied if the city will authorize the treasurer to keep a record of persons desiring to sell bonds and of persons desiring to buy so that the parties can be brought together, and it is probable that a person desiring to sell could, within a short time, find a purchaser; at least it is worth while for a city to make the experiment.

TAX ON TEA? NO

The State (Columbia, S. C.) is not caught by the proposition to put a sixty per cent duty on tea. It points out that the argument based upon the revenue to be produced would diminish as the protective argument increased. We might start out by collecting a revenue on tea, but if it resulted in a growth of tea plantations, we would find that tea planters would be like other protected industries and demand increasing protection. If, in the end, we raised all the tea we needed, and imported none, we would get no revenue, and yet we would be asked to continue the duty for the benefit of the home industry, just as we are asked to continue indefinitely the duties that were first defended as revenue duties, and then as temporary protective duties.

PROFESSOR S. S. HAMIL

Mr. Bryan has learned with sorrow of the death of Professor S. S. Hamil under whom he studied elocution when a student in college, and from whom he received substantially all of the instruction he ever received in that study.

Professor Hamil was born in 1833 and when at the University of Miami was a college mate of President Harrison and President McKinley, Professor Swing, Whitelaw Reid, and a number of other men of prominence. Dr. E. Benjamin Andrews, late chancellor of the University of Nebraska, Ex-Governor Yates of Illinois and Ex-Governor Fifer of Illinois were pupils of his.

RETAIL PRICES

Senator Gore has made himself the champion of the retailers in resenting the charge made by the advocates of a high tariff to the effect that the retailers, and not the manufacturers, are to blame for higher prices. Mr. Gore demands an investigation, and the investigation ought to be had. In expressing his own opinion upon the subject the Oklahoma senator points out that the trusts are in many cases fixing the price at which the retailer sells, and are so fixing that price that the retailers' profit is reduced to a minimum while the trusts' profit is enlarged.

TOO BAD, OF COURSE

Yes, it is too bad to have the democrats divided over the tariff rate on lumber and the rates on iron ore, but the republican newspapers must not become so absorbed in the discussion of this division as to forget the division between republicans over the same schedules. The republican papers can not consistently criticize a few democrats for voting against free lumber and free iron ore without criticising the republicans who did the same thing, but they may not worry about inconsistency.

THE PEARL OF PSALMS

Rev. E. Arnold Wright, of Birmingham, Ala., has issued a little booklet entitled "The Pearl of Psalms"—the twenty-third Psalm. He has caught the spirit of the Psalmist and given poetic elaboration to the thought. His little book deserves a large circulation. The pamphlet sells for 12 cents, postage prepaid, or 85 cents per hundred.