

Speaker Henderson's Confession.

In the light of Speaker Henderson's withdrawal from the congressional race a report of the plain talk indulged in by Iowa republican leaders at the conference held at Des Moines, September 4, will be interesting.

Perhaps the most interesting report of this conference was made by Walter Wellman, correspondent for the Chicago Record-Herald.

Mr. Wellman says that Governor Cummins "faced the seven or eight congressmen and threw his remarks straight at them." The governor said:

"It is time for plain speaking, and I give notice here and now that I am going to take an active part in this campaign and that I am going to give great prominence to this issue. We republicans of Iowa are all protectionists, we are radical protectionists, but we insist that the tariff must be removed on articles in which monopoly has been established. We call upon congress to place legislative obstacles in the way of the tendency of modern combinations to destroy competition. Competition is the fundamental law of industrialism, and we are not willing to have the tariff used in throttling or perpetuating it. That is what our platform means when it says no sheltering of monopoly, and that platform is not to be repudiated. It stands, and we stand upon it. We are in earnest and we want the people to know it."

Mr. Wellman admits that most of the Iowa republican members of congress have no sympathy with the Iowa tariff plank. In the light of this statement it is difficult to understand what importance is to be attached to Governor Cummins' statement that the no shelter for monopoly plank "stands and we stand upon it. We are in earnest and we want the people to know it." If Governor Cummins and his associates are in earnest, the way to show their earnestness is to defeat the republican candidates who declare that the Iowa tariff plank is "a dirty lie."

Replying to the governor, Speaker Henderson said:

"If I had had my way about it I would not have adopted this clause about sheltering monopoly, simply because I do not want a whisper of suspicion of the purity of the mother of prosperity. But we can all stand on this platform. If there are monopolies under the tariff no man can object to this plank. But it is all in the subjunctive, you see. If we find upon investigation the tariff is being wrongly used we will correct it."

And then Mr. Wellman reports as follows:

"Speaker Henderson then declared that it would be impossible to pass any tariff legislation next winter. He added that in the long session of the new congress, which meets in 1903, he favored a revision of some of the schedules by the ways and means committee of the house and the finance committee of the senate. He caused some surprise by saying that last winter he had proposed to President Roosevelt and leading republican senators that they reduce the tariff on a few articles, 'IN ORDER TO GIVE THE PEOPLE SOME RELIEF,' but that the senators had declared it would be impossible to get any such bill through their branch of the national legislature."

It is interesting to learn that the republican speaker suggested to the republican president and other leading senators that they reduce the tariff on a few articles "in order to give the people some relief;" and it is equally interesting to learn that these republican senators had declared that it would be impossible to get any such bill through their branch of the national legislature.

Speaker Henderson's statement that the reduction of the tariff on a few articles would give the people some relief would naturally imply that the reduction of the tariff on a number of articles would give the people considerable relief. Why not give the people a little more than "some relief?" Why not give them relief all along the line? The answer is found in the confession that it was impossible to persuade the republican senate to even give the people "some relief."

Senator Dolliver, according to Mr. Wellman, took an interesting part in this discussion. The senator endorsed Governor Cummins' position. He declared that Mr. McKinley had commended the Iowa tariff plank adopted August 14, 1901, which was identical with the Iowa tariff plank of 1902. Senator Dolliver said:

"The tariff of 1897 is in many particulars unsuitable to the conditions of 1902. For years we have been telling the people that we would do something toward broadening trade by means of reciprocity treaties. We have had power in all branches of the government, but we have done nothing. One or two men in the senate have defeated every treaty, and say they will kill everything of the sort. The re-

publican party has got to stop a lot of its conversation or take up these treaties and some of the tariff schedules and do something toward satisfying public expectations. It is not surprising that the people are a little weary of promises. The republican party on this question is like a ship with all sail set and anchored fast. It is time to take in the sail or pull in the anchor."

Referring to Speaker Henderson's suggestion that the tariff plank was all in the subjunctive, Mr. Wellman says that Senator Dolliver knocked out the subjunctive by declaring that he knew some men who were trying to build a railroad in Iowa and who had wanted to buy some rails of the steel trust. The trust had catechised them as to what they were going to do with their railroad when built, about rates and so forth, and had refused to sell them rails, the result being that the men had been compelled to import rails at much higher cost than rails can be sold for in this country. Mr. Dolliver also said leading hardware men of this state had told him they had been summoned to the headquarters of the steel trust and asked to agree to buy their supply in a certain place, the penalty for refusal being that their supply of barbed wire would be cut off entirely.

Mr. Wellman assures us that Senator Dolliver's speech created "a marked sensation."

Self-Government Preferable.

The attention of the editor of The Commoner has been called to an epigram coined by a minister in the course of a sermon, namely: "Self-government is preferable to good government." The phrase was used in defending the wisdom of the plan whereby man was made a free moral agent and left to choose between good and evil, rather than created as a perfect being or placed in an environment which made sin impossible. There is no doubt that a Creator capable of making a world could have made man perfect and could have relieved him of all temptation, but instead of that He placed man in a world full of temptation and made him responsible for his conduct. Instead of being placed under the arbitrary power of some one who would care for and protect him, he was left to govern himself and made to suffer if he failed to govern himself well. We do not find fault with this arrangement of Providence nor do we question the wisdom of the plan.

There is a very evident analogy between the self-government of the individual and the doctrine of self-government in nations. As the individual has a right to make mistakes, the penalty being suffering, so people who govern themselves have a right to make mistakes, paying the penalty for lack of wisdom. In no other way can people be taught to take an active and intelligent interest in public affairs, and only by taking an interest in public affairs can they perfect themselves in the art of self-government.

The people of the United States govern themselves, and yet it is evident that they make frequent mistakes. The republicans asserted in 1896 that the people would make a mistake if they elected the ticket nominated by the Chicago convention, and they further insisted that a terrible punishment would follow the mistake. The democrats, on the other hand, asserted that the people would make a mistake if they elected the republican ticket. They assert now that the people are suffering from the mistake. The reign of trusts is a direct consequence of the republican victory of 1896, and so is the imperialistic policy which has plunged this nation into enormous expenditure and led it to appropriate nearly forty times as much for the army and the navy as it expends on the department of agriculture. The republicans are constantly asserting that the election of a democratic president in 1892 brought hard times and filled the country with soup houses. A majority of the democrats are willing to admit that the election resulted in mistakes, but they insist that the mistakes of the democrats were made in the adoption of republican policies rather than in the carrying out of democratic theories of government. But these instances are cited only to show that we recognize the liability of people to make mistakes, even when so far advanced in civilization as the American people are. Who would be willing to accept foreign domination even if assured that such alien government would be absolutely free from error?

Why not apply to the Filipinos the same logic that we apply to ourselves? Why not recognize that they have a right to self-government, even if they are liable to make mistakes? Why not recognize that the punishment which comes from those mistakes is in itself an educating influence? Why not recognize that self-government, with all its imperfections, will be better for the Filipinos than any outside government which could be forced upon them against their will?

Not only is "self-government preferable to

good government," but among mortals with their selfishness and short-sightedness self-government is likely to be better than any irresponsible government, for no nation can be selfish enough to desire colonies and yet unselfish enough to govern them wisely.

What Place?

The reports all indicate that Gen. J. S. Clarkson took an active part in organizing republican sentiment in New York for President Roosevelt in opposition to Senator Platt's plans. Iowans will not need to be assured that he was exactly the man for the place. As a worker and an organizer in a political fight even Senator Platt is not his equal. The senator is said to have asked when General Clarkson was appointed surveyor of the port of New York if he had been active in politics. The reply was that he had not, but that he would be "more active in the future." The senator understands it now.—Des Moines Register and Leader (rep.).

"Iowans will not need to be assured that he was exactly the man for the place."

But what place? —the position of surveyor of the port of New York, to be sure.

That was the place to which General Clarkson was appointed by Mr. Roosevelt.

This republican paper does not point to any improvement which General Clarkson may have made in the operations of the office committed to his care. It does not say that it has developed that he was "exactly the man for the place" because of the strict attention he has given to his official duties and the high character of service he has brought to his employer, the government.

But because General Clarkson, as surveyor of the port of New York, "took an active part in organizing republican sentiment in New York for President Roosevelt in opposition to Senator Platt's plan"—that is the reason that General Clarkson is "exactly the man for the place!"

"As a worker and an organizer in a political fight," says this republican paper, "even Senator Platt is not his equal." To be sure, to be sure!

Clarkson was "exactly the man for the place"—the place being one of the best offices in the gift of the president, because "as a worker and an organizer in a political fight even Senator Platt is not his equal!"

And yet Theodore Roosevelt is the gentleman who made himself famous as a champion of civil service reform.

"Lots of Five."

The Commoner's "Lots of Five" plan of subscriptions commends itself to all who are interested in the preservation of democratic principles, and who are determined that the democratic party shall not be given into the hands of those who would republicanize the party and make it so like the republican party that the trusts and monopolies would be willing to accept it. The Commoner discusses present day problems from the democratic standpoint and loses no opportunity to expose the plans of those who would use the democratic party for mercenary purposes. Its influence is limited only by its circulation, and in order to extend its influence and circulation it has inaugurated the "Lots of Five" subscription plan. The plan is as follows:

Subscription cards in lots of five, each card good for a year's subscription to The Commoner when properly filled out and returned to this office, are sold at the rate of \$3 per lot. This is at the rate of 60 cents per year for each subscription. The Commoner asks your assistance in extending its circulation. If you will help, cut out the coupon printed below, fill it in as directed, and mail to this office. A lot of five cards will be sent you and you may remit for them after you have disposed of them.

APPLICATION FOR

"Lots of Five Subscription Cards."

PUBLISHER COMMONER: Please send me five subscription cards. I promise to use my utmost endeavor to sell these cards, and will remit for them at the rate of 60 cents each when sold.

Name

Postoffice

County

State