

faring man, though a republican, need not be deceived, and we are glad to note that many prominent and wideawake republicans are not. For a complete analysis of this most important subject, every American citizen, interested in his country's welfare, should read The Commoner educational series, now running in Bryan's Commoner, one of the best weekly newspapers published, and costing but \$1.00 a year. "Subscribe, read and pass it around," should be advocated by democrats everywhere. Best wishes for The Commoner and the common people, for whom it labors.

E. G. Short, Sheldon, Mo.—I am glad to have granted me the privilege of expressing some views in regard to the change of front of some of our representatives that we have always thought to be democrats. As the situation now presents itself I can't understand it. I have always understood that when a man made the race for an office he was bound by the platform that was written for their guidance; the platform is supposed to express the desires of the people who believe in the principles it advocates. When an official violates this trust he is assuming a power that does not belong to him. No man holding an office in the congress of the United States has the right to assume a power that is contrary to the will of his people and to use it in a way that they may think is injurious to them. I can't conceive why any official that is a democrat and is now serving as such in the congress of the United States who has the temerity to think that they have become so much a power in the democratic party that they can cast aside the platform of that party and use their influence and vote contrary to what his constituents feel are an injury to them. It is possible that we may be mistaken, but we reserve the right to correct our mistakes. Furthermore if a platform is not binding why need we have a platform? Why not place absolute power in the hands of our officials without any restrictions whatever. This would be authorized despotism if they see fit to use their power in that way. When Senator Stone voted for a duty on iron ore he used a privilege that is granted to every United States senator, the right to express his views by vote; but in this case he repudiated our platform contrary to the wishes of the people that made him a senator. If he can explain to our satisfaction we will want to know what kind of democrats we are. Mr. Stone said in reply to Mr. Bryan's criticism of his vote that he thought he understood the situation better than Mr. Bryan. Perhaps he does. Perhaps he understands the situation better than his constituents, but this we know, that a tariff of twenty-five cents a ton on iron ore is not going to cheapen the price of our farm implements and farm machinery. We also know that we buy hundreds of millions of dollars worth annually. We do this without being benefited by any protective laws; we are absolutely without protection. If protection is such a good thing for a few to give justice to all why not make protection general. The farmers can be protected only by the government giving us a bounty, an ad valorem bounty on everything we produce equal to the indirect bounty given to all protected industries. In case our government should give us a bounty of such protective qualities what would be the result? The result would be a sudden rise on all manufactured products or a sudden decline in the price of all farm products and the farmers would be clamoring for more bounty. This is conclusive proof that protection is not protection, it is robbery and through it the

farmers and other labor are the victims. I have a hope for a better future but not yet. When farmers and other labor learns what is due them they will inherit their own. Does not corporate greed show us that free trade is now the paramount issue. We will have to draw a direct line between protected interests and interests that are not protected. We must do this as the price of our rights as freemen, not slaves, is eternal vigilance.

THE DUTIES ON HIDES

To the Editor of the Evening Post. Sir: In all the discussions about the duty on "hides," I have never seen an intimation of the fact that hides or skins weighing twenty-five pounds or less in the raw state or twelve pounds or less in the dried are free under the present tariff act.

The hides which are dutiable under paragraph 437 of the present Dingley tariff act are the "hides of cattle," and the word "cattle" has been defined by the board of general appraisers and accepted by the treasury department to include animals of the bovine species only, so that the only hides that are dutiable are cattle and buffalo hides weighing over twenty-five pounds in the raw or green state, and over twelve pounds in the dried. Calf skins, goat skins, horse and ass skins, and in fact all other skins, are free. Hides and skins, except sheep skins with the wool on, have been on the free list ever since 1872. The tariff act of 1894 did not even make this exception, as wool was free under that act, but put all hides and skins without exception on the free list.

The present Dingley act put skins on the free list in the following language (par. 664):

"Skins of all kinds, raw (except sheep skins with the wool on) and hides not specially provided for in this act."

After the passage of the Dingley act July 24, 1897, the treasury department instructed collectors to assess a duty of 15 per cent on raw calf skins, evidently construing the paragraph putting a duty on "hides of cattle" to include calf skins.

The importers of calf skins protested against this, and claimed that there was a trade distinction between "hides" and "skins" and that as skins were on the free list, all such articles as were known in trade and commerce as skins were entitled to be admitted free of duty. After many hearings had before the board of general appraisers, and a great deal of testimony taken on both sides it was decided by them that the hides were dutiable under the Dingley tariff as "hides of cattle" were only such hides of the bovine species as weighed more than twenty-five pounds in the raw state, and over twelve pounds in the dried, and that all other hides and skins were free, except sheep skins with the wool on, and these rulings were eventually acquiesced in and accepted by the treasury department in September, 1898, since which time only such hides as those above named have been dutiable.

It seems incongruous that a duty should be put on hides only over a certain weight, but the tariff act is full of inconsistencies. This makes cost of boots and shoes to the laboring man higher, as he is the one that wears the boots and shoes that are made out of "hides of cattle."

New York. W. J. GIBSON.

STEALING DEMOCRATIC IDEAS

The people rejected Bryan as their leader, but Roosevelt and Taft have accepted him. Year after year the voters have seen the presidents of the United States repudiate their

campaign pretensions to adopt a policy long advocated by the Nebraskan, and yet when the voters have had a chance to elect the real political leader of the nation to an office that was his by right of constructive statesmanship they have cast him aside. They have heeded and honored his adversaries who denounced him as a "dangerous dreamer," or even as an "anarchist," and who, as soon as they took office, grasped for salvation at his "dangerous" and "anarchistic" policies. Nothing more picturesque than a Taft somersault can be imagined, and yet the genial president has turned a complete and perfect somersault on the income and corporation tax questions. In his speech of acceptance at Cincinnati the republican candidate strongly dissented from that plank of the democratic platform favoring a constitutional amendment for an income tax. It was his belief that no such amendment was needed. As president, however, he proclaims his belief that a constitutional amendment is the only way out of the difficulty. But that is not all. He has adopted the democratic plan of taxing the corporations, and only yesterday, with the aid of his Blackstone cabinet, he prepared the amendment, providing for an excise on all corporations whose net income is more than \$5,000 a year.

President Taft, with his customary frankness, has admitted his mistakes, and, like Roosevelt, has found firm footing on the democratic platform. It will not have escaped notice, however, that he has betrayed himself into many inconsistencies. He announced his purpose of letting the tariff bill take its course without any executive interference. Although he could have made revision

downward certain, he refused to speak the necessary word, pleading that it was not the part of the president to coerce the legislative branch of the government. As soon, however, as Aldrich and his cohorts found themselves face to face with defeat they appealed to Taft, and he promptly took action which doomed the income tax amendment of Bailey and deferred the settlement of the question for several years, at least. He stepped into the breach at the Aldrich behest, although he had ignored the prayers and expostulations of the progressives.—Denver News.

DEATH OF WILLIAM BROWN

The Chicago Record-Herald says: "William Brown, formerly chief counsel for the Chicago & Alton Railway, died at Jacksonville, Ill., yesterday at the age of 70 years. He was a graduate of Illinois College and of Missouri University, and was admitted to the bar in Jacksonville in 1861. He was one of the solicitors for the Wabash railroad and became a member of the law firm of Beckwith & Brown, Chicago, in 1887. He was city attorney in Jacksonville for a time, state's attorney for the first judicial circuit in 1872, and state senator in 1872-74. He was a leader in the democratic ranks and was chairman of the democratic state central committee from 1874 to 1876. William J. Bryan studied law in his office at Jacksonville, and in a speech recently delivered in Jacksonville said that never in his career had he met a man with a greater legal mind. The decedent was the father of William Brown, Jr., of Chicago, who was a candidate for superior court judge on the democratic ticket at the recent election." Former Mayor F. W. Brown of Lincoln, Neb., is also a son.

COMBINATION OFFERS!

WEEKLY COURIER-JOURNAL.....	}	\$1.00
BRYAN'S COMMONER.....		
<hr/>		
WEEKLY COURIER-JOURNAL.....	}	\$1.35
INLAND FARMER.....		
FARMER'S FAVORITE OR HICKORY CLIPPER KNIFE.....		
<hr/>		
WEEKLY COURIER-JOURNAL.....	}	\$1.00
ODDITIES IN SOUTHERN LIFE AND CHARACTER		
<hr/>		
Edited by Henry Watterson—A Book of Nearly 500 Pages.		
<hr/>		
WEEKLY COURIER-JOURNAL.....	}	\$1.00
POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES		
<hr/>		
A Book of 64 Pages, Giving Much Valuable Information.		
<hr/>		
WEEKLY COURIER-JOURNAL.....	}	\$1.00
ABRAHAM LINCOLN—AN ORATION, BY HENRY WATTERSON.....		
<hr/>		
WEEKLY COURIER-JOURNAL.....	}	\$2.50
SUNDAY COURIER-JOURNAL.....		

No commission allowed anyone on above offers. Full amount as printed must be sent to us in every case. Send orders direct to us, not through an agent. The papers will be sent one year each from receipt of orders. Renewals will count the same as new subscribers.

State plainly what you want, inclose proper remittance, and address

Courier-Journal Company
Louisville, Ky.