

announces that he will in his county convention oppose a general indorsement of the Kansas City platform and insist upon specific declarations on each subject included in the platform. He ought to be accommodated, for the friends of the Kansas City platform are not dodgers.

A general indorsement of the national platform is usually sufficient in a county convention because it covers all national issues and a reiteration of each plank, added to the declarations on state and county matters, would make the platform unnecessarily long; but if any Hopkins man thinks he can prevent a reference to the money question by demanding a specific plank he should be answered by a demand for the specific indorsement of every plank in the platform. If he objects to the wording of any plank, let him present his substitute. If he opposes bimetalism, let him present a plank indorsing the gold standard. If he objects to 16 to 1, let him name some other ratio at which he favors free coinage. If he is opposed to the plank condemning banks of issue, let him prepare a substitute favoring banks of issue and stating whether notes should be issued on bonds or assets. If he wants specific declarations he should have his desire fully and completely satisfied and he should be compelled to meet honesty with honesty. If the democratic party is to indorse the gold standard for which republican leaders plotted secretly for twenty years and which they now defend by arguments which they disputed six years ago—if the democratic party is going to indorse this policy, it ought to buy a ticket and enter the republican tent in a dignified way and not crawl in under the canvas when Hanna and our strenuous president are not looking.

Republicans and the Tariff.

Representative Tawney of Minnesota is a member of the ways and means committee. Mr. Tawney is a candidate for re-election. The republicans of Minnesota in their state platform indicated a desire for tariff revision and Mr. Tawney has issued a statement in which he declares that he is favorable to revision, reciprocity, the election of senators by the people, and the enactment of legislation for the regulation and control of trusts. Mr. Tawney points out that at the last session he cast two votes in favor of revision of the tariff; one for the Babcock bill creating a reduction in the duties on the products of the steel trust, the other in favor of the amendment to the so-called Cuban reciprocity bill removing the duty on refined sugar, the product of the sugar trust.

Mr. Tawney then says that he heartily indorses every principle and declaration contained in the Minnesota republican platform and that he adheres to and favors every principle or policy of the national republican platform adopted in 1900. He promises not only that he will work for tariff revision along the line of reduction of duties, including reduction of duties on lumber, but he adds: "I will say to you that if the republicans control the 58th congress, there will be such revision of the tariff."

Perhaps Mr. Tawney means well, even though he assumes the somewhat inconsistent attitude of giving cordial indorsement to the Minnesota platform of 1902 while at the same time he indorses the republican national platform of 1900. His statement indicates that he appreciates the strength of the popular demand for tariff revision, and yet it is difficult to understand what authority Mr. Tawney has for giving his people the assurance that if republicans control the 58th congress, there will be a revision of the tariff. The republicans had the opportunity to revise the tariff at the last session, but they neglected it. They had the opportunity of passing the Babcock bill, and thus reducing the duty on the products of the great steel trust, but they neglected this opportunity. And now even Mr. Babcock, the father of that measure, has abandoned his position, while there is nothing in the attitude of republican lead-

ers generally to give encouragement to the advocates of tariff revision.

The campaign book recently issued by the republican congressional committee, of which committee Mr. Babcock is the chairman, devotes considerable space in an effort to show that the so-called "protective" system of the republican party has benefited the country; there is, however, in this book nothing to give encouragement to the hope held out by Mr. Tawney.

At its last session the republican congress failed to provide tariff revision, reciprocity, the election of senators by the people, or the enactment of legislation for the regulation and control of the trusts, four accomplishments which Mr. Tawney would have his people believe they may expect at the hands of the republican party. Failure in these respects was not mere oversight, for the republican congress deliberately defeated measures introduced for the purpose of accomplishing these results.

The republican state convention of Minnesota and the republican state convention of Iowa were conspicuous because of the position taken by these two conventions on the tariff question, a position that was in marked contrast with that of other republican conventions.

Do these republican leaders expect that the people of Minnesota and the people of Iowa will elect republicans to congress in the hope of obtaining tariff revision, while the people of other states will elect republicans to congress in the hope of preventing tariff revision? Manifestly they do, and it may be that the republican majorities in these two states are so large that republican leaders have good reason for the faith that is within them. But some time in the not distant future there will be a change. It will occur when the people of these two states and the people of other states learn what they should have learned long ago, that republican platforms are not made to stand on, but are made to get in on; when they learn that there is nothing in the creed of present day republicanism that prevents a republican candidate in New York from making one pledge in behalf of his party, while a republican candidate in Minnesota and in Iowa makes a wholly different pledge in behalf of the same party. Some time there will be a day of reckoning.

A Simple Statement.

The Chicago Tribune, republican, in an editorial declares:

It is a notorious fact that some of the tariff schedules do afford shelter to monopoly. That is, they permit certain trusts or combines to exact from domestic consumers unreasonably high prices for their products—prices higher than could be exacted if the tariff afforded no more protection than is necessary to enable the American producers to compete on even terms with their foreign rivals.

As some trusts make an illegitimate use of the protection they enjoy, why should the republicans of Iowa and of the United States hesitate to say so? Why should not they promise to deprive the trusts of a shelter they are abusing? The language used in the Iowa platform is not a confession that the tariff is the parent of trusts. There are trusts in free trade England. The language is a simple statement that the party which made the tariff will change the tariff whenever it appears a wrongful use is being made of any of the duties levied by it.

If it was proper for the republicans of Iowa to admit that some trusts make an illegitimate use of the protection they enjoy, why was it not proper for the republicans of Illinois to make the same admission? Why did the Illinois republicans fail to make that admission in their platform? Why did the republicans, in national convention assembled, fail to make similar acknowledgement of the truth?

If it is a notorious fact that some of the tariff schedules do afford shelter to monopolies, why

wait for convention resolutions? Why did the republican congress at its last session refuse to adopt the bill introduced by the democrats, providing for the reduction of the tariff duties on trust-made products? Why did they shelve the Babcock bill, a measure introduced by a republican, providing for the reduction on the products of the steel trust?

If it is a notorious fact that some of the tariff schedules permit trusts or combinations to exact from domestic consumers unreasonably high prices for their products, why did the republican congress adjourn without providing a remedy for the consumers of the country?

Of what value is "a simple statement" that the party which made the tariff will change the tariff whenever it appears a wrongful use is being made of any of the duties levied by it, in the presence of the fact that the party which made the tariff derives its campaign funds from the great corporations that thrive by the tariff and impose upon the people through the privileges obtained under the tariff?

Of what benefit is this "simple statement" in the presence of the fact that the party which made the tariff, although being in control of the White house, the senate, and the house of representatives, failed to change the tariff even though its candid party papers and leaders are required to confess that it is "a notorious fact that some tariff schedules do afford shelter to monopoly."

Legislative Twins.

That eminent republican newspaper, the New York Sun, does not appear to take kindly to the tariff plank in the Iowa republican convention. The Sun directs attention to house bill No. 15109. This bill was introduced by a democrat, Mr. Richardson of Tennessee. The bill was as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when it is shown to the satisfaction of the president and secretary of the treasury that articles and commodities are manufactured and controlled or produced in the United States by a trust or trusts, the importation of such articles and commodities from foreign countries shall be free of duty until, in the opinion of the president and secretary of the treasury, such manufacture, control or production shall have ceased.

Sec. 2. That when it is shown to the satisfaction of the president and secretary of the treasury that any article or commodity which is manufactured in the United States is sold in a foreign country more cheaply than the price at which the same article or commodity is sold in the United States, the rate of duty on such article or commodity shall be reduced by the president and secretary of the treasury 50 per centum of the present rate, or to such extent as to prevent the continuance of such irregularity and injustice, and remove the indirect tariff bounty which promotes the same.

The Sun declares that this bill is in line with the tariff plank in the Iowa republican convention, which plank indorses "any modification of tariff schedules that may be required to prevent their affording shelter to monopoly." The Sun points out, however, that neither of the senators and no member of congress representing Iowa, either introduced such a bill or gave any support to the measure; and the Sun refers to the Richardson bill as "the practical legislative twin of the theoretical suggestion advanced by the Iowa republicans."

The Sun goes to considerable trouble to prove, what every one must know, that democrats object to affording shelter to monopoly in any legislative act relating to the tariff or other questions.

Ten years ago the editor of The Commoner introduced in the house a bill similar to the one introduced by Mr. Richardson. This bill provided that whenever any federal circuit court should find that a trust or conspiracy in restraint of trade existed, in respect to any article upon which any duties were laid, by the existing tariff law of the United States, it should be the court's duty to