

## The Commoner.

terested in reform ought to know the means resorted to by our opponents.

The second reason for calling attention to this letter is that it suggests what might happen if voters generally were as illiberal and as partisan as some of the so-called business men. There is as much reason why the ordinary citizen should refuse to patronize a store owned by a political opponent, or to purchase an article manufactured by one differing from him in political opinion, as there is for a business man to refuse to advertise in a paper which antagonizes his views on public questions. No principle is sound which is not capable of general application. The principle adopted by the corporation whose letter is quoted would inject strife and bitterness into every business community.

Bankers have sometimes refused loans to, or threatened to withdraw loans from, persons holding opposite political views, without seeming to realize that the application of the same principle by depositors would bankrupt the institution.

As a rule, however, men mingle together in business, in society, and at church without regard to their political opinions. It is not because they lack convictions, but because they have a proper conception of the privileges and duties of citizenship, and recognize the right of each person to have and to express his views on all subjects. It is fortunate that narrowness is the exception rather than the rule.

### A Lesson to Rulers.

Lord Macaulay, in his history of England, describes the growth of trusts and monopolies three hundred years ago. He tells how the people at last arose and demanded redress, and how the queen, seeing that she could no longer resist public opinion, gracefully yielded. The historian points to her example as a lesson to rulers. In the hope that the lesson may not be lost upon those now in power, the description is reproduced:

"It was in the Parliament of 1601 that the opposition which had, during forty years, been silently gathering and husbanding strength, fought its first great battle and won its first victory. The ground was well chosen. The English Sovereigns had always been entrusted with the supreme direction of commercial police. It was their undoubted prerogative to regulate coin, weights and measures, and to appoint fairs, markets, and ports. The line which bounded their authority over trade had, as usual, been but loosely drawn. They therefore, as usual, encroached on the province which rightfully belonged to the legislature. The encroachment was, as usual, patiently borne, till it became serious. But at length the Queen took upon herself to grant patents of monopoly by scores. There was scarcely a family in the realm which did not feel itself aggrieved by the oppression and extortion which this abuse naturally caused. Iron, oil, vinegar, coal, saltpetre, lead, starch, yarn, skins, leather, glass, could be bought only at exorbitant prices. The House of Commons met in an angry and determined mood. It was in vain that a courtly minority blamed the Speaker for suffering acts of the Queen's Highness to be called in question. The language of the discontented party was high and menacing, and was echoed by the voice of the whole nation. The coach of the chief minister of the crown was surrounded by an indignant populace, who cursed the monopolies, and exclaimed that the prerogative should not be suffered to

touch the old liberties of England. There seemed for a moment to be some danger that the long and glorious reign of Elizabeth would have a shameful and disastrous end. She, however, with admirable judgment and temper, declined the contest, put herself at the head of the reforming party, redressed the grievance, thanked the Commons, in touching and dignified language, for their tender care of the general weal, brought back to herself the hearts of the people, and left to her successors a memorable example of the way in which it behoves a ruler to deal with public movements which he has not the means of resisting."

### He Takes No Chances.

A California reader of THE COMMONER has sent in a bank note which is used by a California bank. It must be signed by two persons and guaranteed by a third.

The rate of interest usually charged is 10 per cent, and, according to the wording of the note, principal and interest draw interest at the rate of 24 per cent a year after maturity.

It is evident that the banker who uses this note is determined to take no chances. The ordinary farmer or business man is unable to protect himself in this way, and this may account for the fact that the banker, on an average, is more prosperous than any other member of the community. Such cases show the necessity for an usury law.

Below will be found a copy of the note:

\$..... Cal.....190...  
 .....days after date, at three o'clock p. m.  
 of that day (no grace) for value received, I promise to pay to the order of.....  
 ..... Dollars,  
 at the ....., with interest, payable monthly,  
 at the rate of ..... per cent. per..... until  
 paid. If said interest be not paid when due, it shall be added to the principal, and bear interest at the same rate as the principal, and the whole amount of principal and interest shall thereafter be due and payable at the option of the payee. Principal and interest payable in Gold Coin of the United States; and should this not be paid at maturity it shall thereafter bear interest at the rate of two per cent per month.  
 No.....  
 .....

### Gov. Bradley's Testimony.

In the trial against Ripley, one of the men charged with complicity in the assassination of Governor Goebel, Governor Bradley gave testimony which will effectually close the mouths of those who have attempted to defend ex-Governor Taylor. Bradley is a republican in politics, and a man whose general reputation for truth and veracity has never been questioned. He testified that Ripley reported to him a conversation which he, Ripley, had had with Taylor, then Governor, in which the latter declared that Goebel would be killed within a day. The language used by Taylor was "My God! Haven't you brought your men yet? Bring them at once! Goebel can't live another day," or "won't live another day."

Governor Bradley also testified that he learned of a plot to assassinate Goebel, and sent for the parties who had the matter in hand, and told them that it must be stopped, or that he would apprise Goebel of the plot, and escorte him from the capital grounds himself.

The testimony of Governor Bradley, taken

in connection with the other circumstances in the case, makes it clear that Taylor was aware of the plot to assassinate Goebel. It will shock the public at large to know that there is conclusive testimony connecting the executive of a state with a scheme to assassinate his political rival. So long as there was no positive proof, the friends of Taylor might excuse themselves for refusing to believe him guilty, but in the presence of such testimony as that furnished by Governor Bradley, and corroborated by Judge Yost, even the most extreme partisans of Taylor will be silenced.

### Aspirations—Pure and Impure.

Captain Lara of the Manila Police was assassinated sometime ago, and his widow has been granted, by the American authorities, "exclusive cockpit privileges." It is explained in the dispatches that this is in the way of "compensation for the murder of her husband, who was commander of the native police." It is also said that this is the first time the American authorities have granted permission for cockfighting in Manila. But this being the national sport of the Filipinos, there "will probably be legislation in regard to it."

It is very touching, indeed, to see on the part of the American authorities such zealous concern for the "national sport" of the Filipinos. It is good also to be told that there will probably be legislation in regard to this. No doubt, it will be provided that the "national sport" shall not be interfered with. It was also very touching to see the widow of this police captain granted an exclusive cockpit privilege. Perhaps it was not much in the way of "compensation," but the good woman doubtless accepted it as part compensation and part tribute to the habits and customs of the Filipino people.

But if we are to manifest so lively a concern for cockfighting because it is the "national sport" of the Filipinos, would it not be well for us to manifest some concern for the purer aspirations of those people? If cockfighting is to be defended and upheld because of a reluctance to interfere with the Filipino aspirations, should we not be somewhat reluctant to stamp out the Filipino aspirations to liberty and a government based on the consent of the governed?

### The Representative's Duty.

A reader of THE COMMONER has asked whether a representative should give expression to his own convictions or be governed by the wishes of his constituents. There are two theories on the subject. The first is that the people think for themselves and select representatives to give legislative effect to their wishes; the other theory is that the people are incapable of thinking for themselves and choose representatives to do the thinking for the rest of the people.

The former is the democratic theory. There is more intelligence and integrity among the people than ever finds expression through representatives. The fact that constitutions are referred to the people for adoption is evidence of this, as is also the fact that the voting of