

tection of the nation's natural resources, in timber, coal, iron and oil, against monopolistic control, the development of our waterways for navigation and every other useful purpose, including the irrigation of arid lands, the reclamation of swamp lands, the clarification of streams, the development of water power, and the preservation of electric power generated by this natural force from the control of monopoly, and to such end we urge the exercise of all powers, national, state and municipal, both separately and in co-operation.

We insist upon a policy of administration of our forest reserves which shall relieve it of the abuses which have arisen thereunder and which shall, as far as practicable, conform to the police regulations of the several states wherein the reserves are located, which shall enable homesteaders as of right to occupy and acquire title to all portions thereof, which are especially adapted to agriculture and which shall furnish a system of timber sales available as well to the private citizen as to the large manufacturer and consumer.

GRAZING LANDS

The establishment of rules and regulations, if any such are necessary in relation to free grazing upon the public lands outside of forest or other reservations until the same shall eventually be disposed of should be left to the people of the states respectively in which such lands may be situated.

PAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS

The democratic party recognizes the importance and advantage of developing closer ties of Pan-American friendship and commerce between the United States and her sister nations of Latin America and favors the taking of such steps, consistent with democratic policies for better acquaintance, greater mutual confidence and larger exchange of trade as will bring lasting benefit not only to the United States but to this group of American republics having constitutions, forms of government, ambitions and interests akin to our own.

PANAMA CANAL

We believe that the Panama canal will prove of great value to our country and favor its speedy completion.

ASIATIC IMMIGRATION

We favor full protection by both national and state governments within their respective spheres, of all foreigners residing in the United States under treaty, but we are opposed to the admission of Asiatic immigrants who can not be amalgamated with our population or whose presence among us would raise a race issue and involve us in diplomatic controversies with oriental powers.

CONCLUSION

The democratic party stands for democracy; the republican party has drawn to itself all that is aristocratic and plutocratic.

The democratic party is the champion of equal rights and opportunities to all; the republican party is the party of privilege and private monopoly. The democratic party listens to the voice of the whole people and gauges progress by the prosperity and advancement of the average man; the republican party is subservient to the comparatively few who are the beneficiaries of governmental favoritism. We invite the co-operation of all, regardless of previous political affiliation or past differences, who desire to preserve a government of the people, by the people and for the people and who favor such an administration of the government, as will insure as far as human wisdom can, that each citizen shall draw from society a reward commensurate with his contribution to the welfare of society.

NO SPECIAL RATE TO DEMOCRATS

The following dispatch carried by the Associated Press explains itself:

Chicago, August 7.—Norman E. Mack, chairman of the democratic national committee, was notified tonight that no reduced railway rates will be put into effect for the Bryan notification meeting at Lincoln, Neb., August 12. The communication came from Eben McLeod, chairman of the Western Passenger Association, in reply to a letter sent to that official by Mr. Mack earlier in the day and calling attention to the fact that reduced fares had been granted on the occasion to the Taft notification in Cincinnati, whereas no concessions had been made for the democratic gathering. The correspondence was interspersed by several telephonic conversations between Messrs. Mack and McLeod,

the latter explaining the action of the railroads by referring to the fact that no reduced rates had been put into effect for any events in Nebraska since the passage of the two-cent fare law in that state. He also emphasized the fact that the reduced rates to Cincinnati were offered by the Central Passenger Association.

"The action of the roads is simply a discrimination against the democratic party," said Mr. Mack. "They state there is a two-cent rate in Nebraska which will not permit them to give a reduced rate to Lincoln. But I desire to call attention to the fact that there is a two-cent rate in Ohio, which did not prevent a grant of reduced rates to the Taft meeting. As I understand it, most of the railroads which compose the Central Passenger Association are also members of the Western Passenger Association."

Mr. Mack's letter to Mr. McLeod follows:

"Directing your attention especially to the occasion of the notification of the democratic candidate, William J. Bryan, which will take place at Lincoln, Nebr., August 12, my attention has been called to the fact that the local committee at Lincoln has made application to your committee for special rates over lines in that territory for that occasion and that they have received notice that it will be impracticable to accord anything other than the ordinary rate of two cents a mile. I have received an urgent demand from the chairman in charge at Lincoln that I take this up with your committee and make a strenuous effort to secure a substantial reduction. I must seriously insist that our party is entitled to the same consideration and favor on the occasion of our notification meeting that was accorded to the republican party on the occasion of their notification meeting. The date of our notification meeting is so near at hand that there is little time for consultation or conference with regard to this matter, and I trust that you will see your way clear to at once take such action as will remedy this apparent discrimination and give us a special rate within your territory for this meeting on August 12, at Lincoln, Neb., which will at least be equal to the rate accorded to the republicans for their recent meeting at Cincinnati. Kindly notify me at your earliest convenience of your final action in the premises. Sincerely yours,

"NORMAN E. MACK."

DEMOCRATIC PRESS COMMITTEE

Henry Watterson, editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal, who is chairman of the newspaper committee of the democratic campaign, made public the names of the democratic press committee of advisement as follows:

- Alabama—Birmingham Age-Herald, W. W. Barrett; Montgomery Advertiser, W. W. Screws, F. P. Glass.
- Arkansas—Little Rock Democrat, Clio Harper.
- Colorado—Denver Rocky Mountain News, T. M. Patterson.
- Connecticut—Hartford Times, W. O. Burr; Haven Union, Alexander Troup.
- Georgia—Atlanta Constitution, Clark Howell.
- Kentucky—Lexington Herald, Desha Breckenridge.
- Louisiana—New Orleans Picayune, Thomas E. Davis; New Orleans Times-Democrat, Page M. Baker.
- Maine—Portland Argus, Thomas E. Calvert.
- Massachusetts—Boston Globe, Charles H. Taylor; Lowell Sun, John H. Harrington; Worcester Post, E. M. Moriarty.
- Michigan—Grand Rapids News, J. W. Hunter.
- Mississippi—Jackson Clarion-Ledger, R. H. Henry.
- Missouri—Kansas City Post, B. L. Sheridan; St. Louis Republic, Charles W. Knapp.
- Montana—Helena Independent, J. S. Neill.
- Nebraska—Omaha World-Herald, Gilbert M. Hitchcock.
- North Carolina—Charlotte Observer, J. B. Caldwell.
- Oklahoma—Oklahoma City Oklahoman, Roy E. Stafford.
- Pennsylvania—Philadelphia Record, Theo. Wright; Pittsburg Post, Albert J. Barr.
- South Carolina—Columbia State, A. E. Gonzales; Charleston News and Courier, J. C. Hemphill.
- Tennessee—Chattanooga News, J. C. Rice; Knoxville Sentinel, G. F. Milton; Nashville American, Charles H. Slack.
- Texas—Galveston News, John R. Hedges.
- Virginia—Richmond Times-Dispatch, Joseph Bryan.
- West Virginia—Wheeling Register, J. A. Miller.
- Washington—A. J. Blethen, Seattle.

REVISION UPWARD

In his speech of acceptance Mr. Taft, speaking of the tariff, said:

"On the other hand, THERE ARE SOME FEW SCHEDULES IN WHICH THE TARIFF IS NOT SUFFICIENTLY HIGH to give the measure of protection which they should receive upon republican principles."

This is sufficient to prove that "revision of the tariff" as understood by the republican leaders does not mean revision in the interests of the people, but does mean that the protected interests will receive first consideration. It also demonstrates that the Indianapolis News, a republican newspaper, knew what it was talking about when, in its issue of July 2, it said:

"All that was needed to prove that the republican tariff plank is a delusion and a snare, as far as the tariff reformers are concerned, was the commendation of the American Economist, the high tariff organ. This it now has. The Economist is fairly jubilant over the victory won in behalf of extreme protection. 'The republican party,' it says, 'in national convention assembled, has declared anew for the policy of protection—protection that shall be adequate—and has rejected the demands of the tariff agitators for a revision of the tariff downwards.' Which, of course, means that the party has declared, either in favor of leaving the tariff as it is, or of revising it upward. We quote from the Economist, which, be it remembered, is the uncompromising champion of Dingleyism:

"The free traders and advocates of tariff revision downward will not find a word or syllable in this tariff plank that tends to furnish them the slightest crumb of comfort. There is no promise in the platform of tariff revision downward. * * * After full consideration of the whole subject, the republican party in convention assembled did not declare for revision of the tariff downward, nor did it give the slightest intimation that the belief is entertained by the great body of republicans throughout the land that the tariff rates of the Dingley law are too high."

"Even the maximum and minimum tariff plan which is advocated contemplates, according to the Economist, making the present rates—or other 'adequately protective rates'—the minimum, and the imposition of still higher rates to force fair treatment from other nations. We do not often find ourselves in agreement with the Economist. But it seems to us that what it says about the amazing plank adopted at Chicago is true. Every one knows that there are hundreds of thousands of republicans all over the country demanding tariff revision in the direction of lower rates. Manufacturers who are held up by the trusts feel very deeply on this subject. When the convention met it knew just what this demand was, just what it meant. It knew that it could not be silent on the tariff question, knew that it could not refuse to pretend to promise a real revision.

"And yet this convention put itself on record as favoring sufficient protection to put our manufacturers absolutely on a level with those of other lands, and then to give them 'a reasonable profit' besides. This can mean nothing else than what the Economist says it means. It is no promise of revision downward. The proposition is not to equalize condition: here and abroad, not to make up to our manufacturers the excess of the wages they are supposed to pay over those abroad, not to help them out in the matter of raw material, but after having done all these things, after having removed every obstacle, and taken off every handicap, we are to tax ourselves to give the manufacturers—such as the steel trust—'a reasonable profit.' So it is a great victory for the standpatters. The Economist is quite right. For once it is absolutely right. The party has thrown itself into the arms of the standpatters. Taking this plank in connection with the refusal of the convention to demand publicity for campaign contributions, and also in connection with the great activity of the agents of the steel trust at Chicago, it is hard to see how any tariff reformer can get much hope from the tariff plank of the republican platform. There is less comfort than ever to be got from it now that the American Economist, a besotted high tariff organ, has commended it with such touching enthusiasm."

Mr. Taft says workmen "have a right to accumulate funds to support those engaged in a strike." But another Ohio judge, following the Taft injunction precedent, restrained the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union from paying strike benefits.