

iod, nor shall any monopoly of freight room for any one article or articles to any one shipper or shippers be given by any individual or corporation drawing either mail or general subsidy under this act.

The defeat of these three amendments shows the complete subviency of the supporters of the subsidy and the senators who voted against these amendments ought to be made to feel the wrath of an indignant and outraged constituency.

Senator Culbertson endeavored to secure an amendment limiting the subsidy to July 1, 1907; Senator Bacon tried to set apart one-fourth of the subsidy for ships engaged in trade between the United States and South America, and also presented an amendment permitting the cancellation after four years of any contract made with a ship owner; Senator Patterson offered an amendment prohibiting the employment of Chinese seamen; Senator Mallery offered an amendment withholding the subsidy from any one who had within a year entered into a contract in restraint of trade or for the controlling of rates; Senators Vest, McLaurin of Mississippi, Teller and others also offered valuable amendments, but the republicans voted solidly against all of them and yet when Senator Hanna brought in his amendment repealing the Sherman anti-trust law so far as it applied to ship owners, the republicans, with the exception of Allison, Cullom, Proctor, Spooner, and Quarles, were ready to vote yea. The following is the Hanna amendment:

Provided, however, that nothing contained in this act, OR IN ANY OTHER ACT OF CONGRESS, shall be construed to prevent any citizen or corporation of the United States or of any state from contracting for, acquiring, holding or operating any interest in one or more steamship lines engaged in foreign commerce.

The senators voting for this amendment were Aldrich, Bard, Beveridge, Burnham, Burrows, Burton, Clark (Wyo.), Deboe, Depew, Dietrich, Dillingham, Dolliver, Dryden, Elkins, Fairbanks, Foraker, Frye, Gallinger, Gamble, Hale, Hanna, Hansbrough, Hawley, Jones (Nev.), Kean, Kearns, Kittridge, McComas, McCumber, McLaurin (S. C.), McMillan, Mason, Mitchell, Nelson, Penrose, Perkins, Platt (Conn.), Scott, Warren, Wellington, and Wetmore. Senators Clapp, Lodge, Millard, Platt (N. Y.), Pritchard, Quay, Simon, and Stewart were paired in favor of the bill and in favor of the amendments supported by the republicans and against the amendments opposed by the republicans.

These names are given because the ship subsidy will be an important issue in the coming congressional campaign and readers of The Commoner must be prepared to bring this subject to the attention of their republican neighbors. The vote for the bill on its final passage was the same as for the Hanna amendment except that Dolliver and Dillingham, who voted for the amendment, voted against the bill, and Cullom, who voted against the amendment, voted for the bill.

### A Righteous Veto.

Governor Cummins of Iowa is entitled to the thanks of every friend of good government, because of his recent veto message. The legislature of Iowa had passed a bill authorizing a change in the law relative to the indebtedness of railroad corporations. The bill removed the limit of indebtedness as fixed by the present law and left it with the stockholders to fix the amount of indebtedness by a clause in the articles of incorporation.

Under the present law the limit is \$16,000 per mile, or two-thirds of the capital stock, if that would permit more than \$16,000 per mile. An active railroad lobby was behind the bill and it was properly known as "the merger bill." It was claimed, and a familiar claim it was, that if this bill were passed, the railroad companies would be able to raise more money and make large improvements throughout Iowa.

In his veto message, Governor Cummins said

that he could not resist the belief that the real application of the proposed amendment would not be to enable the two or three railroad companies to which it would apply to improve their properties, for their own profit and for the advantage of the people, and he added: "Its only substantial effect would be to overcome the real or imaginary difficulties growing out of the purchase of the stock of the Chicago Burlington & Quincy Railroad company by the Great Northern and Northern Pacific Railroad companies." In conclusion Governor Cummins said:

It is one thing to grant to railway companies the right to borrow the money needed to aid in the construction and equipment of their lines of railway; it is quite another thing to authorize a class of railway companies to incur unlimited obligations without respect to the amount of their stock or the worth of their property. I cannot bring myself to believe that this species of special legislation is consistent with the public welfare or necessary for the legitimate development of railway property; on the contrary, it is my firm belief that corporate power to issue stocks and incur indebtedness needs regulation rather than expansion.

When a republican governor has the courage to rise above the enormous influences working within his own party for corporate advantage, he is entitled to more than ordinary praise. Governor Cummins is a brave man, and deserves the laurels which he is now wearing so gracefully.

### Begin at the Primaries.

The democrats of Tully East precinct, Van Wert county, Ohio, held a convention or primary a few days ago at which they passed resolutions declaring their adherence to the Kansas City platform and to the principles therein set forth, and they instructed their delegates to carry out their wishes. Attention is called to this precinct for the purpose of emphasizing the fact that the friends of democratic principles must make their fight at the primaries if they expect to win. Democracy pure and undefiled is stronger with the voters than it is with the democrats who are in the habit of attending conventions remote from the people. There are two reasons for this. In the first place, those who can pay railroad fare or secure passes to attend conventions far away from home are the ones among whom the defection was greatest in 1896. Some of the well-to-do democrats are connected directly or indirectly with large corporations, and others are so under the influence of the financiers that they are not always at liberty to express their convictions.

In 1896, and to some extent in 1900, the corporations terrified democratic voters and compelled them to give support to the republican party. Some of these came back in 1900 without being entirely emancipated from corporation control. They plead for harmony, and ask the democrats to be generous and send them to conventions. They generally object to instructions on the ground that instructions are humiliating, and then when once entrusted with authority they proceed to harmonize by emasculating the democratic platform and turning the organization over to the men who are indifferent to democratic principles. The Chicago convention came nearer representing the actual sentiment of the rank and file of the democratic party than any national convention held in recent years, and it did so because the voters made their fight in the precincts and carried their instructions all the way up to the national convention.

The friends of the Kansas City platform must be on their guard. If they would defeat the plans and purposes of the reorganizers they must introduce into every precinct convention or primary a resolution indorsing the Kansas City platform and instructing delegates to vote for the adoption of the resolution in the convention to which they go. If any man is unwilling to be instructed, let

him remain at home. A man who is not willing to carry out the wishes of those who elect him has no right to represent men of convictions.

The reorganizers have never fought an honest battle, in the party or out of it, and they will not make an open attempt to change the policy of the party. They will object to instructions; they will object to the indorsement of the Kansas City platform without presenting their own platform, and then if they can secure control of a convention they will adopt a platform that is ambiguous and uncertain, with the hope of deceiving the voters.

East Tully precinct has set a good example; let it be followed by every other precinct in the United States. If the reorganizers want to make a fair fight let them introduce a resolution repudiating the Kansas City platform and instructing the delegates to favor the repudiation of that platform and the adoption of a gold standard platform. Then the issue can be met clearly and the result will not be doubtful.

### The Sanguinary Mr. Hawley.

"I have an utter abhorrence of anarchy, and would give a thousand dollars to get a good shot at an anarchist."

These were the words of Senator Hawley. They were delivered in the United States senate March 19.

Mr. Hawley may be pardoned for his impetuous statement. Probably he did not half mean it, and yet one would suspect that "abhorrence" of anarchy is not so utterly "utter" on the part of a man who, at the very moment of giving expression to this "abhorrence," boasted of his willingness to pay a considerable sum for the privilege of being, for the moment, a disciple of anarchy.

The best blow that has been struck at anarchy in recent years was the orderly manner in which the trial of Mr. McKinley's assassin was conducted. Doubtless there were many people who would have esteemed it a privilege to have participated in the swift punishment of the assassin, but the fact that the people, suffering under a great national and personal grief, showed their real abhorrence of anarchy to the extent that they demanded even for the miserable assassin of Mr. McKinley the same orderly and fair trial that would be accorded any other person, was in itself one of the greatest object lessons in law, one of the greatest demonstrations of order's superiority to anarchy that has ever been offered to the world.

### Is it Possible?

In a letter addressed to Speaker Henderson, Mr. Birge, a prominent republican and merchant of Keokuk, Ia., says:

There is a storm brewing in the mind of the average American as to existing conditions, and the congressman who fails to realize this will find himself in the near future relegated to the shade of home life. I find many intelligent republicans who feel as I do, that the time has come when it is the business of the republican party to look the whole question square in the face and to lower the protective tariff to its legitimate ends, that it shall be no longer prohibitory,

Can it be possible that the rank and file of republicans in the great state of Iowa have concluded that after all it is not the part of wisdom to permit a handful of leaders to do their thinking for them? It is not strange that republican congressmen fail to take notice of the storm that is brewing. These republican leaders have had such remarkable success in pulling the wool over the eyes of the rank and file of their party that it is not in the least surprising that they look lightly upon such warnings as that presented by Mr. Birge.