

CAMPAIGN EXPENSES

Representative William D. Jamieson of Iowa has announced that he will not be a candidate for re-nomination. Mr. Jamieson is quoted as saying that he can not afford to hold the office. He explains that out of his first term's salary he might save about \$4,000 per year, thus giving him a surplus of \$8,000. But he adds that all of this amount would be exhausted in the campaign for re-election.

Expressing regret because of Mr. Jamieson's retirement, one newspaper says that there are only two ways of correcting this condition. One is by members of congress moving in an organized way to avoid expensive social interchanges and the other is by raising salaries.

The salary of the member of congress is already sufficiently high. If there were no other proofs on this point Mr. Jamieson's statement that he could save \$4,000 per year is conclusive, and that statement also indicates that expensive "social interchanges" may be avoided by a little sensible effort on the part of individual congressmen.

Mr. Jamieson's own statement indicates the direction toward which inquiry should be directed. Why should it be necessary for a candidate for congress to expend \$8,000 in an effort to secure re-election? To be sure Mr. Jamieson is a democrat and his district is normally republican. To be sure some money is needed for postage, printing and railroad fare. But it must be clear to thoughtful men that there is something decidedly wrong in American habits with respect to political expenditures when so large a sum as \$8,000 would be necessary for the payment of the campaign expenses of a congressional candidate.

Mr. Jamieson is a popular man throughout his district. He has made an excellent record. It ought to be possible for a man with such a record as Jamieson has to reach his constituents without the expenditure of an enormous sum of money. Doubtless Mr. Jamieson's campaign committee would be as economical as any other. And so it is probably true that the effort toward reform on this line should be directed toward the general practice in the expenditure of campaign funds. The republican party has had a great deal to do with the increasing tendency toward extravagance in this matter. In 1896 it adopted an unprecedented system of campaign assessment, collected more money than it could have honestly spent in several presidential campaigns and taught rising political managers that the successful politician is a man who collects the most money and that a big campaign fund spells victory. But democrats must understand that they can not hope to compete with republicans in the matter of campaign funds. They will find, too, that a fund sufficient to pay ordinary expenses will enable them to win whenever their platform and their candidate meet the public demand provided the scales have fallen from the eyes of voters; and if voters are still blinded all the campaign funds that democrats could raise would be of no effect compared with the trust magnate's bank account, which is always available to the republican party.

Let democrats everywhere exert their efforts toward the framing of real democratic platforms and the nomination of real democratic candidates. Then while they collect sufficient funds to meet ordinary expenses let them set themselves resolutely against the temptation to compete with the republicans in the way of campaign expenditures. Let them depend for success upon the merits of candidate and platform, the industrious and disinterested efforts of good citizens and finally upon intelligent appreciation by the people. They will yet appreciate the dangers involved in a continuance of republican rule and they will appreciate the efforts of a political party that, in the moment of the people's need, puts its best foot foremost in the way of platform and candidate.

BUT WHY HIGHER AND HIGHER?

Defending the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, the Philadelphia Public Ledger, republican, says: "A protective tariff, from its very nature and purpose, must be the result of long and complex study, of much log-rolling and of mutual accommodation and concession. At the very best, it can only approximate to universal justice or to general satisfaction."

According to the testimony of Senator Dolliver of Iowa, Nelson Dingley, father of the Dingley tariff law, the producer of the Payne-Aldrich law, said that the rates in the Dingley law had purposely been placed high in order that they might be used as a basis for reciprocity agreements with other countries. It was never in-

tended that these high Dingley rates should become fixed charges. But no sooner had this law been passed, than the tariff barons took advantage of the high rates, and no serious attention was given to reciprocity. Prices were advanced in this country under the protection of the Dingley rates—then the highest in American history.

So burdensome were these rates that the rank and file of republicans protested and their protests were so strong that the republican party promised in its national platform of 1908 to give the people tariff revision. They "fulfilled" this pledge by revising the tariff upwards, making the rates even higher than they were in the law against which the people were protesting.

Now the Public Ledger says that tariff making is a very complex affair and that at the very best tariff measures "can only approximate to universal justice or to general satisfaction." Admitting this to be true, why should the tariff rates go higher and higher? Why should the effort always be in favor of the generous contributors to republican campaign funds rather than in favor of the consumers who comprise the mass of the people? Why, after the republican party had promised tariff revision did it revise the tariff upward? Could it not have "approximated to universal justice or to general satisfaction" by reducing the rates at least a trifle? Could it not have handled this "complex proposition" with some consideration for public interests rather than with exclusive consideration for the tariff barons?

THE SAME OLD THREAT

Senator Hale, in announcing his intention to retire at the end of his present term, warns his constituents that democratic success will mean that "Maine's principal industries and interests will be marked for slaughter." It is the same old threat that has been trotted out every campaign for thirty years to scare the timid voter into supporting the predatory interests. It has been worth more than one hundred and fifty thousand dollars in salary to Senator Hale and many millions to those to whom the taxing power has been surrendered. But so many republicans at last understand the larcenous character of the high tariff laws that it looks as if the scare would not work any longer.

MR. BRYAN'S PROPHECY

From the Washington, D. C., Bulletin: In reply to a very pessimistic letter by the writer to Mr. Bryan just after the November election, he made a prophecy, which, in view of recent events, seems prophetic. The writer believed that the republican party would keep its platform pledges. Mr. Bryan did not and replied: "Do not be deceived by the promises of the leaders of that party. It is impotent to revise the tariff in the interest of the people. We are nearer the turn in the lane than appears on the surface." Bryan was right. The special session of the republican party was impotent. And everybody will admit that "we are nearer the turn in the lane."

ANOTHER DEMOCRATIC VICTORY

The house of representatives has passed the publicity bill with but one dissenting vote. It will be remembered that the democratic platform advocated publicity while the republican platform was silent on the subject. The democratic platform and the action of the democratic committee in putting the plank into operation forced Candidate Taft to advocate publicity. It is a democratic victory to get the bill through the house. Let us hope that it will run the gauntlet of the senate and become a law.

GOVERNMENT

The three most important subjects which a human being can consider are God, man and society. Religion and government come next—in fact, they are the connecting links which bind God, man and society together. Tolstol has defined religion as the relation which man fixes between himself and God, and government may be defined as the relation which man fixes between himself and society.

DISCOVERING AN IDEA

Under the terms of the street railway franchises in Chicago the companies must pay into the city treasury, April 10 of each year 55 per cent of their net receipts. This year the sum amounted to \$1,286,598.76. A Chicago dispatch, printed in the Denver Times, says:

"It might be supposed that the million and a quarter of net profits that went into the city treasury on Monday was all the two companies paid—that the sum covered taxes, care, license

fees and the like—but such is not the fact. There are two street railroad systems here—the Chicago City Railway company and the Chicago Railway company. The Chicago City Railway company is the smaller of the two systems. The Chicago company paid to the city nearly twice as much as the Chicago City company—under the 55 per cent net income claims of the agreements under which the two companies are operated. The balance sheet of the Chicago City company, the smaller of the two, shows that in addition to the \$474,822.22 it paid as 55 per cent of its net income, the company also paid the very large sum of \$525,000 for general taxes. The Chicago Railway company, the larger of the two, in addition to the \$811,776.54, which it paid under the 55 per cent net income clause, paid nearly \$1,000,000 additional as general taxes. The tribute paid by these two companies to Chicago for 1909 may therefore be summed up as follows:

| | |
|--|------------|
| Chicago City Railway company 55 per cent of net-revenue.....\$ | 474,822.22 |
| Same company, general taxes.... | 525,000.00 |
| Chicago Railway company, 55 per cent net revenue..... | 811,776.50 |
| Same company, general taxes.... | 900,000.00 |

Total\$2,711,598.72

The partnership between Chicago and its street railway companies is not a bad thing by any means. It is a good illustration of what a city that understands the value of its franchises can do when it has in mind the value of the city's franchise property and is determined to make operating companies pay it something near its value."

It is a fact that in most cities the people surrender to the corporations the use of their streets and then put in considerable time pleading for fair facilities and reasonable rates of fare. In such cities it is a constant struggle on the part of the representatives of the people and the results are far from satisfying. In Chicago the people began to take the right view of the part the corporation is to play in public life. They discovered that the people granted the favor in giving life to the corporation and in surrendering the use of the streets. And so they demanded some sort of recompense.

The IDEA is by no means fully developed in Chicago. They have but a hint of it there but it is gratifying to observe that the IDEA is growing throughout the country. Men are beginning to learn that the corporation being the mere creature of law should be the servant rather than the master of the people by whom and for whom the law is made.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Senator Owen's bill providing for the establishment of a department of public health, to be under a secretary of health who shall be a cabinet officer, is a good measure. It ought to be enacted into law. In his speech advocating the passage of this measure, Senator Owen said: "The agricultural bureau was of no great comparative value until it became a department, and now its enormous value is not questioned by any man. It has been worth thousands of millions of dollars, and its value is annually increasing. It has wisely taught us how to protect plant life, tree life, animal life, and is a noble, dignified department. Is plant life, tree life, animal life confessedly worthy a great department and human life unworthy of a department? I recently sent 25,000 bulletins to farmers in Oklahoma on how to raise swine. I had no bulletins to send out how to protect the health of children. I believe in giving first place to conservation of human life without neglecting plant life or animal life."

UNDISPUTED

One G. F. Smith, signing himself "Yours Calmly," wrote to the New York World to say: "Why not state the truth boldly once for all? Without exaggeration, Theodore Roosevelt is the greatest man in all respects who ever lived or who ever will live on this earth or on any of the other planets."

And the World did not have the courage to question the truth of this calm statement.

©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©© ©
© The American Homestead, a monthly ©
© farm journal of national scope, will be ©
© sent to all Commoner subscribers, with- ©
© out additional cost, who renew their sub- ©
© scriptions during the month of May. ©
© Take advantage of this offer at once and ©
© send in your renewal. ©
© ©
©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©©© ©