

the TWELVE PER CENT tariff on the TWENTY PER CENT (that is on lumber).

Senator Bailey contends that it makes no difference to the steel trust whether tariff is levied on iron ore or not, but Senator Smith of Maryland declares that the representatives of the steel trust expressed a desire to have the tariff on iron ore retained. It is safer to judge their interests by their REQUEST than to accept Senator Bailey's opinion.

The democrats contend that the tariff is a tax and that a tax levied upon an imported article enables a manufacturer to collect a like amount upon all competing domestic articles. As the steel trust produces from twenty to thirty times as much iron ore as is imported, it is reasonably safe to conclude that the steel trust will derive a great deal more profit from the iron ore tax than the government will derive revenue.

The democratic platform demanded tariff reduction and specified that the reduction should begin by putting upon the free list imports that come into competition with trust controlled products. Iron ore offered a splendid opportunity to apply the platform, but Senator Bailey and seventeen other democratic senators refused to do so.

In his letter to Governor Beckham, Senator Bailey does not discuss the binding force of platforms, but he has been quoted as denying that a platform is binding upon congress—he has so declared, at least by his vote in favor of a tariff on lumber, for the platform specifically demanded free lumber.

Mr. Bryan, in his acceptance speech last year, pointed out that a candidate if he objected to a platform should repudiate it before an election, not afterwards.

The Commoner respectfully submits that while an individual senator or congressman may be willing to repudiate a platform after the election the masses of the people have acted upon the theory that a platform is binding, and the democrats in the house and senate have charged the republicans with indifference to their platform pledges. It is unfortunate that any democrat should follow the republican example and thus strike a blow at the fundamental doctrine of representative government, namely, that the representative shall give voice to the wishes of his constituents. It is unfortunate, also, that democrats in the senate and house should put themselves in a position where practical opponents can accuse them of voting benefits to trusts for, however guiltless the democrats may be, the party is sure to suffer if the votes so cast will actually benefit the trust, even though they were cast without any intention of benefiting the trusts.

If the doctrine announced by Senator Bailey becomes the doctrine of the democratic party the party might as well abandon its opposition to a protective policy. First, if senators and members can not be bound by platforms, then there is no hope of resisting the influence that the protected interests bring to bear upon the public officials. Second, if, instead of lessening the number of those benefits by protection, we are to increase the number by extending protection to all industries, we will find it next to impossible to make any headway in the direction of tariff reform for those who derive a pecuniary benefit from the tariff—even though that benefit be incidental—will be active opponents of any reduction, while the public, feeling only a general interest, will be unable to cope with the special interest.

The Commoner regrets that Senator Bailey has felt it his duty to take the two positions above referred to. If the party joins him in the position that a platform is not binding, then the voters are left at sea and have no way of enforcing their wishes. If the party endorses the position taken by Senator Bailey in regard to raw materials the day of tariff reform is more remote and the position of a tax-ridden people more hopeless.

GOVERNOR JOHNSON'S VETO

The Chicago Record-Herald prints this dispatch:

Minneapolis, June 25.—Governor John A. Johnson replied today to the attack made upon him by William J. Bryan in the last issue of his Commoner, criticising the governor's veto of the tonnage tax bill as a violation of a promise made in the democratic state platform.

"I do not think Mr. Bryan understands the situation, the bill, my veto, or conditions surrounding it," said Governor Johnson. "In discussing our platform last fall before the people I said I would veto any bill that would do harm

to any particular section of the state. Mr. Bryan is undoubtedly in error in his conclusions as to this veto. He does not understand the matter, and I think if he would take time to investigate it his views would change. I do not care to discuss the question any further, for my reasons were set forth in the veto message, and it is unnecessary to repeat them."

Governor Johnson says that he announced during the campaign that he would veto any unjust measure taxing ore. That is not specific enough to constitute a repudiation of the platform, but The Commoner will be pleased to publish extracts from such speeches if the governor will send speeches with date and place of delivery.

NOT THE GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

In the Commoner of June 25 an editorial was reproduced from the Lincoln (Neb.) News. In this editorial the "Georgetown University" was mentioned as having fallen under the strictures of the Carnegie foundation. This was a typographical error. It was the "George Washington University" located at the national capital, and not the "Georgetown University," that was disciplined by the management of the Carnegie pension.

RESIGNATION OR PUNISHMENT

It is interesting to read the editorials which are appearing in the republican papers now. They are preparing the people for a disappointment—making an air cushion, as it were, to fall on. The Denver Republican is one of the latest to take up this task. In a recent issue, under the title, "Let Well Enough Alone," it indulges in a labored effort to show that the Dingley bill is not so bad after all. It begins: "If the extraordinary session of congress would adjourn without date, having determined after grave consideration and debate and many paper experiments that the Dingley tariff measure now in effect can not be improved upon, the nation at large would heave a sigh of relief and the treasury of the United States would begin to refill."

And yet it was this very Dingley law that aroused all the agitation in favor of tariff reform; it was the Dingley law that caused President Taft to travel through the west and hold out the hope of tariff reduction; it was this very Dingley law that republican reformers promised to revise in the interest of the consumer—and now these reformers would be delighted to accept the Dingley law as a compromise. The tariff barons have control of congress and are audaciously, impudently and arrogantly raising the tariff rates.

So completely have the tariff reform republicans been routed that they are proposing to lay down their arms if they are only assured that the tariff wall will not be made higher! What an ignominious failure! But RESIGNATION will be the cry of the thick and thin republican papers from now on; the republican voters will be urged to be resigned to their fate and to make no faces while they swallow the bitter dose that the leaders are preparing. But if patience ever ceases to be a virtue that time is certainly here; if righteous indignation is ever justified it surely is now. A whip of scorpions is the thing needed now—not talk of resignation and "let well enough alone."

UNITED STATES COURT VS. NEBRASKA

United States Judges Vandeventer and Munger have granted a temporary injunction restraining the enforcement of the Nebraska statute providing for the guaranty of bank deposits. The judges have not yet given their reasons and it is impossible, therefore, to discuss the grounds upon which their decision rests. The fact that two United States judges, one a non-resident, and both appointed by a president living in another state can, without awaiting action by the state courts, interfere with the operation of a law enacted by a Nebraska legislature to regulate Nebraska banks organized under Nebraska laws and accepting deposits from Nebraska people compels the citizens of the state to consider the question of the state's right to control its own affairs and protect its own people. The fact, too, that bankers doing business in Nebraska would ignore the state judges and rush into a United States court is significant; it indicates that while they are willing to make their money in Nebraska and to use the state courts to collect debts due them they are not willing to trusts the courts of the state to interpret the laws passed to

guard the interests of the people of the state.

It is not fair to assume that the supreme court of the United States will, on appeal, deny to the people of Nebraska, acting through their legislature, the right to determine the security which a state bank will give to depositors, but in the meantime the voters of Nebraska should leave no doubt as to their determination to have security for their deposits.

DO YOUR WORK AT THE POLLS

A number of shoe manufacturers, tanners and retailers have caused to be sent to their patrons throughout the United States, a circular urging them, in what might fairly be termed hysterical language, to write to their congressmen and to President Taft urging them to prevent the meat trust from having its way.

One of these circulars was sent to J. W. Morgan, a Starke, Florida, business man. Mr. Morgan's reply ought to be read in every precinct of the United States and by every resident thereof. Here it is:

Starke, Fla., June 26, 1909.—National Free Hide League, Chicago, Ill. Gentlemen: I am in receipt of your circular letter concerning the question of free hides. I am heartily in sympathy with the idea of free raw material, but as for writing to my congressman, or to the president, not much, Johnny.

I dare say 75 per cent of the members of the numerous associations whom you claim are affiliated in this effort to curb the meat trust, were also affiliated last year in the effort of keeping the party in power which is now revising the tariff on the upward grade. Why didn't you affiliate, when you had the chance last year, to put a party in power, which was pledged to a downward revision? You came squarely up to the "parting of the ways," gentlemen, but you took the same old route, with the result that you are up against it in the same old way, only more so. Now take your medicine, gentlemen. You helped to mix the dose—it's just what you voted for, now take it. I hope you get your hide chuck full of it. It's free and you'll get more than you want without even the trouble of asking for it.

The people had a chance for better things last fall at the ballot box. Like one of old, they chose the "mess of pottage." Now, let the meat trust and the oil trust, and the grand old, trust-controlled republican party fill their hides so full of the burdens of taxation (without representation) that they will finally feel the death grip placed on them, the yoke will be so galling that the worm will turn at last. If oppression is the only thing to bring the people to a realization of their wrongs, let oppression be poured out on them. Don't write to your congressmen, gentlemen. Sit up and during the next four years while you are trying to dodge the lemons which your party is busily engaged in preparing for you, resolve by the help of God, and the party of Jefferson, Jackson and Bryan, that your votes will be cast for the lifting of the burden from the weary back of this great American common people, of whom you are one, and I am one. Your appeals are useless now—as well strap yourself to the tail of a cyclone, and expect to float on in the enjoyment of sweet repose and pleasant dreams. I'm sorry for you, but not too sorry to hope that you'll get your hide full. It's the only thing that will ever teach you anything, apparently.

Truly yours,
J. W. MORGAN.

Democrat's Literature

DEMOCRATIC LITERATURE
Kanawha Falls, W. Va., June 16, 1909.
The Commoner: I am sending herewith two new subscribers to The Commoner. This was done with very little effort on my part. In order to put the democratic party in power again we must put good, sound, democratic literature before the people to read. In West Virginia we have only about one-half as many democratic papers as republican. I believe it is possible to put The Commoner in the hands of two million voters, with a paid up subscription, and with this accomplished within the next two years we will win a magnificent victory at the polls in our next election. With best wishes for The Commoner, I am,
Yours very truly,
PHILIP CONRAD.