

The - Plattsmouth - Journal

Published Semi-Weekly at Plattsmouth, Nebraska

R. A. BATES, Publisher.

Entered at the Postoffice at Plattsmouth, Nebraska, as second-class matter.

\$1.50 PER YEAR IN ADVANCE

The Democrats of Otoe county did not do as well as the Democrats of Cass. They only got three out of the nine candidates. We are pleased to note, however, that W. W. Willson for county judge, and A. P. Young for county clerk, are re-elected, and J. A. White was elected commissioner.

The successful candidates on the Democratic ticket owe Dr. J. S. Livingston, chairman of the committee, a debt of gratitude for the efficient manner in which he managed the recent campaign in this county. While he failed in securing the election of several that should have been, he done all in his power to elect the entire ticket.

If Billy Andrews, who has so long held down the job of auditor of the treasury at Washington,—who has so long been drawing at the public teat,—comes back to Nebraska and becomes a candidate for the governorship on the Republican ticket, even Jim Dahlman would find it easy picking to land the plum he's after. The public get tired of men like Andrews.

The great slump in the Republican majority in Massachusetts is sufficient to convince the people that the robber Aldrich tariff is cutting considerable figure in the east, as well as the west. The majority for the Republican candidate for governor is comparatively small, and is getting down to where the Democrats and tariff reformers will stand some show next year.

WHY NOT BE HONEST?

In a recent issue of the Lincoln Journal we find the following: "Why not be honest in politics as in other things? Now and then a Republican newspaper makes the situation of the party more embarrassing by advancing the argument that the platform of the party a year ago did not call for a downward revision of the tariff. It called for that or it called for nothing. Nobody on earth was pleading that any of the tariff schedules were too low. The nominee of the Republican party repeatedly alluded to the need of a tariff less altitudinous, and specifically mentioned a few necessities that might be placed on the free list without ruining the country. Let's stick to the truth at all hazards, for the truth never hurts any except those who need hurtings."

There is a great deal of truth in the above, and we are pleased to see our Republican contemporary take the stand it does. One of the first speeches made by President Taft on his last junketing tour was to the effect that the new tariff law "was the best tariff law ever enacted" and at the same time he had advocated a reduction of the tariff in the campaign in which he was successful. The close of the campaign in this state, which just ended, was disgraceful for some of the "dirty" work done. Some Republicans sent out circulars attacking the Republican nominees for supreme judge, signed by "Progressive Republican League." Of course the Republicans said that it was the work of Democrats, and Hayward even made the bluff of offering \$100 for the name of the person who issued the circulars. In such matters it would have been better to have been honest. That circular cost the Democrats many votes. Then there was a circular sent from Omaha to saloon keepers telling how the Democratic party was going to foist prohibition on the party. It is not hard to guess from where these circulars came, but they served their purpose of antagonizing the liquor dealers against the Democratic nominees for supreme judge.

Why not be honest? No party

can gain anything by putting in power incompetent men or men who place party above law and justice.

THE CARDINAL'S LETTER.

The letter of Cardinal Gibbons to the National League of Civic Education for women, in which he expresses opposition to woman suffrage, is a notable contribution to the debate on the subject.

The cardinal's views on the question have been expressed before, but not so directly and with such emphasis. Of course what gives importance to his utterance is his character as a thinker and the position of reverence he occupies in the regard of millions of people, embraced in an organization absolutely opposed to divorce and who therefore would be supposed to be predisposed to pay great heed to any warning having for its motive the protection of the happiness and integrity of the home.

The statement of the cardinal cannot fail to have great power. This was undoubtedly realized by the league, for it has taken the pains to secure the cardinal's consent that the letter be published.

In another respect the letter is notable. It is among the very few earnest and emphatic statements that have been made on the question by men of equal prominence.—World-Herald.

DANGERS OF CANNONISM.

If anything were needed to enforce the thought that "Uncle Joe" Cannon is the real ruler of the United States, it is supplied by the testimony of President Taft himself.

At Baton Rouge President Taft said: "I'll agree to keep punching Uncle Joe to the point where he may make an admission; to accomplish that feat between St. Louis and New Orleans, I will have done something equal to the work of making the river better."

The president makes admission that Speaker Cannon is a bigger man than himself. He makes admission that Speaker Cannon is the dictator of legislation, the one man in the country who can say whether or not a measure will go through. If the president shall persuade him, or punch him along where he will make an admission, he says he "will have done something equal to the work of making the river better."

No matter what the president wants, no matter what congress wants, Speaker Cannon must be satisfied before anything is done. And the president has enlisted in the work of "punching" him!

Isn't it a nice situation? The king of England, the emperor of Germany, neither has such power. Isn't it a nice commentary on free and independent government? And this a democracy!

By the president's words Cannonism has become more than ever a national issue, because it strikes at representative government. When a president of all the people admits and advertises that one man holds the key to the situation, he admits and advertises that the government is no longer representative. With this the state of things, there is no government by the people and our boasted self government, by individuals, collectively asserting their desires, is but a mockery. And when that individual by choice, coercion, intimidation or association, is the tool of the protected interests and the hounds of special privilege, there can be no gainsaying the fact that the people must arise in their might, even as they arose in every other great crisis, and destroy that power.

Cannonism is but the seed of cen-

tralism and centralism is not democracy and consequently it is not representative government. The people cannot afford to allow the seed to get a start; it must be dug up and its power destroyed.

It becomes more and more apparent that the rules of the house must be changed to allow representatives of the people a free hand to prevent the re-election of Cannon, the seed of centralism—which means individual power. We do not admit that the defeat of Cannon will kill off Cannonism but it will clip the wings of the danger that lurks about us.

Under Cannonism the constitution has become so twisted and disfigured that it is almost unrecognizable. There is not such equality as was intended by the makers of the government. The poor man has not the opportunity of the rich man. The favored few are represented by the power behind the throne; the many are denied such representation as intended through the gagging and throttling of their chosen representatives. The party which upholds Cannonism must finally answer to the people.—Waterloo (Ia.) Times-Tribune, Rep.

We are willing to wager that Polard is not the Republican candidate for congress next year.

The late election denotes that the people of Nebraska are getting tired of the Hayward-Rosewater regime.

Fred Patterson is elected after all. The final count gives him 65 majority for surveyor. Hurrah for Fred.

The people do not want the Aldrich robber tariff, and are speaking out in no uncertain tone against Cannonism.

The people of Nebraska are getting pretty tired of Bill Hayward's sympathetic manner of running campaigns. In the late contest he has fully demonstrated that as a campaign manager he is a signal failure.

Joe Blackburn has received a suggestion that he resign his job on the Panama canal. It pays \$14,000 a year. The suggestion comes from a Republican politician, who perhaps wants the job. Blackburn, you know, is a Democrat.

Judge Good run well in Cass county, didn't he? In fact the slim majority by which the Republican candidates carried the county, denotes that all the Democratic candidates ran well. The people of Nebraska are getting awful tired of Hayward-Rosewater ring rule.

"The state judiciary ticket is elected all the way from 10,000 to 25,000 majority" said Billy Hayward, chairman of the Republican state committee the night of the election. He isn't making any such figures now. But it was yesterday, "I believe the Republicans have won by a small majority."

YOU HAVE THE ANSWER.

"What is there in it for me?" Consciously or unconsciously this is the question that comes to mind whenever a new proposition or an old in a different guise is presented.

"What is there in it for me?" That is what the merchant says or thinks when asked to become a member of his state association. The answer is that there is just as much in the state association as the merchant will get out of it—and the merchant can get out of the association just as much as he puts into it, plus interest compounded. This seems somewhat paradoxical but it is true, nevertheless. The merchant who puts in merely his annual dues will get that much out of it, plus interest. But the merchant who adds energy, enthusiasm and personal work to his dues will be more than repaid.

"What is there in it for me?" The average human is so constituted that he is not satisfied with indefinite or general results. When he pays out money he wants to get something tangible in return. He is

not satisfied with the consciousness of having done his duty—he wants results that can be cashed in at the bank. And so the association gives him such results, but their volume and their value depend very largely upon the individual member and not upon the amount of his dues. That is to say, the association provides means for accomplishing certain results, but the member must use these facilities intelligently, else he will not get maximum results.

"What is there in it for me?" Credit information, for one thing—knowledge that will make you money or prevent you from losing money every business day. But don't expect your fellow members to do it all. When you get an association request for credit, give it immediate attention. That is the way you want your requests handled.

"What is there in it for me?" Co-operation of live merchants in fighting your battles—in fighting for things you want and ought to have and in fighting against those that are harmful. But it takes two or more to co-operate. Nobody else can take your place or do your work in any co-operative movement. It is decidedly up to you. Your dues help but your personal work is of even greater value.

"What is there in it for me?" Profit and satisfaction if you give your brother merchants a square deal by doing your share of association work. You may not be able to write articles for the press. You may not be an orator. You may not feel able to contribute more than your dues. But there is one thing every live member of the state association can do—and that is to get another live member.

"What is there in it for me?" In seeking for the answer consider some of these wise old laws: "In union there is strength," "United we stand; divided we fall," "We must all hang together, else we shall hang separately."

Ponder a few moments on the strength of organization. Call to your mind the victories in every line of endeavor coming through united effort.

"What is there in it for me?" Just ask yourself. You have the answer. Then reach over for that check book—and don't forget to do the rest. Your state association needs you, but you need the state association a great deal more.—Omaha Trade Exhibit.

THE RESULT IN NEBRASKA.

The Democrats of Nebraska have made a showing in this year's election, that has surprised even themselves and astounded the enemy. It is the first "off year" election since populism was in its prime in which the Republican ticket has not won easily, and by a wide margin. At this writing it cannot be said, with absolute certainty, whether a single Democratic candidate for supreme judge is elected, or a single one defeated. The result is astonishingly close. The World-Herald hopes for the election of all three Democratic candidates. But even if all three should be beaten it would be by a vote so small as to constitute a great victory, and this newspaper would still rejoice.

The result shows that the arguments which were advanced in behalf of the candidates of Judge Sullivan, Good and Dean were considered by the people of this state as weighty and valid. It shows that thousands of good, earnest progressive Republicans went to the polls and recorded their votes against their own party nominees because they were convinced it would be best for their party and best for their state to do so.

The cause of a non-partisan judiciary is strengthened by the result of this election. No matter which candidates are finally shown to have won, the verdict is against a strictly partisan court.

The verdict is against the growing judicial practice of overthrowing popular laws, by a species of bench legislation, on fine-spun technicalities and for reasons in which partisanship plays a part. It is a protest against the annulment of the bank guaranty law as well as against

the annulment of the non-partisan judiciary law.

There are still weightier and larger reasons, however, entering into the result. These reasons were given free play because the unimpeachable character and splendid attainment of the Democratic nominees made it not only possible but pleasant for progressive Republicans to vote for them. And they seized the opportunity to register a vote of protest on state and national issues with which the judiciary, properly speaking, has little to do.

They registered a vote of protest against the treachery of their own party in passing the Aldrich tariff law.

They registered a vote of protest against the action of their own president in holding up Aldrich as a leader for himself as well as his party to follow.

They registered a vote of protest against Cannon and Cannonism, and the fast-mounting reactionary influence which is bending the party, in state and union, to its sinister purposes.

They registered a vote of protest against the proposed central bank issue and the proposed shipping subsidy.

They registered a vote against Rosewater bossism and Rosewater ideals governing the party organization in Nebraska.

And, since the record of the present Democratic administration and the late Democratic legislation was brought zealously into the campaign by the Republican machine as an issue, the result may be taken as a vote of commendation for the administration and the legislature.

The returns indicate conclusively, even should the standpat candidates pull through by a narrow margin, that Nebraska, when the lines are drawn and the issue is joined, is a progressive and not a reactionary state.

The Democrats of Nebraska, in the light of Tuesday's election, will enter the next campaign, standing true to the principles and policies for which they have been contending these many years, with heightened enthusiasm and increased confidence.—World-Herald.

THE TARIFF ON LEMONS.

The last congress increased the duty on lemons. As a natural consequence, which our California friends from their past experience might have anticipated, the railroads there have increased the rate on lemons proportionately to the increase in the tariff. In other words, the roads traversing the California district have hauled the California people a lemon, appropriating to themselves the increase in the tariff.

California railroads have a habit of doing this. On one of our trips west we ascertained that the price of hay in Pasadena had been fourteen dollars a ton. The freight rate was ten dollars a ton. Hay went up to eighteen dollars; the railroads raised the rate fourteen; giving the farmer precisely the same price for his hay that he received before the price went up. This is the policy the railroads have been pursuing in California for years, simply giving the people who produce the stuff enough to keep them at work, and they themselves absorbing all the profits.—Wallace's Farmer.

TAFT'S FRIEND, MR. CANNON.

Of the friendship between Mr. Taft and Mr. Cannon there can be no further doubt. It was shown by the camera in a hundred snapshots. It was reflected in the expression of their faces. "I'll sit by the old man," said Mr. Taft when invited to the center of the platform, and he deposited himself close to Cannon. Mr. Taft with his hand on Mr. Cannon's shoulder, Mr. Cannon with his hand on Mr. Taft's arm made pictures eloquent in their relation of conditions political.

Mr. Taft made his Winona tariff speech after a conference with Mr. Cannon. Mr. Cannon has had a good word to say for Mr. Taft from many platforms and in several interviews. A year ago in the heat, the campaign Mr. Cannon was making speeches,

but he never got nearer the candidate of his party for president than to say "we made no mistake in our work at Chicago." Those who heard Mr. Cannon then were always surprised that the name of neither Taft nor Roosevelt ever passed his lips.

Now it is different. Mr. Taft has come into the fold. But his coming in has not prevented the line of cleavage within the party from being driven deeper. The carrying of the war against the insurgents into Minnesota, Iowa and Kansas has made no change. The insurgents no longer constitute a faction. They have grown to a minority and they are still growing. Mr. Taft read them out of the party to no avail. Mr. Cannon has charged them with treason without effect. Reed Smoot has expressed his abhorrence of them in ingenious confession that peace is impossible. But despite the efforts at smothering the only noticeable thing is that Mr. Taft has taken sides. He is no longer the party peace-maker.

HOW SUGAR IS TAXED.

The average consumption of sugar in a year per capita in the United States is 77.54 pounds. The poor consume more than the rich, because they are so many more of them and anything that increases the price of sugar is a burden on the poor. In the case of other things on which a tariff is placed it is not always so easy to tell just what effect the duty on the imported products, but in the case of sugar there is no sort of doubt about it. The amount of the tariff is added to the cost of the sugar and every consumer pays that much more for his sugar than he would otherwise have to pay.

The McKinley bill took the tariff off sugar and the price went down accordingly. When the tariff was added the amount of it was added to the wholesale and retail price. Of all the taxes collected by the tariff plan the tax on sugar is perhaps the most indefensible and most unbusiness-like.

Under the new law the duties on sugar will run from 95 cents per hundred pounds on the raw sugar to \$1.90 on the refined. The raw sugars, as was pointed out by Senator Bristow in the tariff debate, are purposely made of such a grade that they do not go into common consumption, but they go into the hands of the sugar trust. But on refined sugars the rate is more than doubled, so that the sugar trust by importing the raw sugar pays only 90 cents a hundred pounds, but when it is refined puts on a tariff of \$1.90 a hundred pounds. In addition to that, on Cuban sugars the trust secured a rebate of 20 per cent and as the importation from Cuba amounts to about a million tons per annum, almost entirely raw sugar on which a tariff is 90 cents per hundred pounds, by means of this 20 per cent rebate the trust cleans up the handsome profit of more than \$6,000,000 per annum.

This is a tax that falls especially on the poor. Poor men's families are the big families. It is no uncommon thing for a poor man to have eight children. That means 10 in the family, who consume in the aggregate 775 pounds of sugar in a year. The contribution of that poor man's family to the sugar trust is \$7.75 per annum.

And why should the people of this country be called on to contribute \$70,000,000 per annum to this gang of convicted robbers? Why should they put up \$127,000,000 in order to get \$53,000,000 of revenue?—Farmers Mail and Breeze.

W. A. Edmondson, one of the Journal's good friends from east of Union, came in yesterday afternoon to look after some business matters in the city and incidentally, to renew his subscription to the Journal. Mr. Edmondson's call was much appreciated at this office and he is always considered himself a welcome visitor. He called upon his old friends Frank Kauble and M. Hiatt during his stay in the city and they were overjoyed to renew their old-time acquaintances with him.

Charles C. Parmele is spending today in Omaha looking after business matters.