

sition seems to indicate that the democrats are not united and are dissatisfied with the last platform.

Now, while the last platform lost in 1908, it won in 1910. The American people, in the light of republican misrule between 1908 and 1910 have decided that the democrats were right and have indorsed the democrats' 1908 platform. The democratic rank and file are entirely satisfied therewith and so are all leaders except the inconsiderable minority of "protection" democrats and anti-free raw material democrats, who are really republicans in disguise.

The next speaker, Champ Clark, is a sincere tariff reformer. He is a man who has been tried and tested and found true. When some of his constituents wanted protection on their private industry, he declared that he would retire from public life before he would unjustly tax all the people of the United States for the benefit of a few people of his own state.

Says the New York Press: "And now the democratic party is afraid of the tariff? Afraid, though it has not gained control of the government or even of both branches of congress? Afraid, though it will have only the new house, which could not make a tariff law if it wanted to do so, but which could frame and pass a bill to be passed upon by the voters of the United States from now, so that if the country approved it the American people could, upon that issue, plainly set forth in the bill passed by the democratic house, elect a whole democratic congress and a democratic president as well?" The Baltimore Sun says that this "is an illustration of the jeering attitude of the republicans, who hope that the democrats will get into entanglements over the tariff issue. That there may be danger of this, if no fixed policy is adopted, is indicated by the votes of the democratic senators on various schedules of the Aldrich-Payne tariff bill. The party had not agreed upon any definite course in that emergency, and as a consequence lost the moral effect of united action."

This is a strong argument for the holding of a party caucus of the house democrats, who might consult with the democratic members of the senate as to precisely what sort of a tariff for revenue only bill they should frame. But any other democratic conference than a caucus of congressmen would tend to create confusion. The congressmen have a plain duty before them, and, under Champ Clark's leadership it is probable that they will perform it like men, to the credit of the party, and with the result of a democratic victory in 1912. Tariff for revenue only is the will of the American people. That is the clear commission given to congress by the American people in the recent election. Disloyalty thereto would mean democratic failure, but tariff for revenue only means democratic success.

#### IN NEBRASKA, TOO

Hastings (Neb.) Republican: From what we were able to learn while at the state capital last week there seems to be a growing belief that plans are incubating to, if possible, supplant Bryanism with so-called "conservatism." In other words, certain eastern and western democrats have hatched the scheme to put Bryan down and out so far as his leadership in this state is concerned.

#### IS THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY PROGRESSIVE?

To the Editor of the Denver News: In the general rejoicing over the democratic victories throughout the nation, is it not worth while to ask how much those victories mean in the permanent triumph of democratic principles? It is undoubtedly the hope of every democrat that democratic victory means the triumph of the party principles. But does it necessarily follow? In the election of a man like John Kern to the United States senate there can well be general rejoicing among lovers of popular rights. But take the democratic governors, for they are the men who will dominate democratic councils for the next two years. Glance over the list, including Simeon E. Baldwin in Connecticut, John A. Dix in New York, Judson Harmon in Ohio and Woodrow Wilson in New Jersey. Then add Mayor Gaynor, of New York, always a presidential possibility. Is there any one of these men who stands for what the democratic party in the main stands for? I do not say that there is not. I only fear that such will not prove the case. Baldwin is not a presidential possibility. Neither is Foss of Massachusetts who is, after all, a real progressive. The others are. Let

us hope they will stand for real progressive principles.

Now it is well known that all these democratic governors are in open hostility to Mr. Bryan. They do not stand for his principles; they do not favor the kind of democracy in the main that he favors, and that the west favors. The line of cleavage is very well marked between these two types of democrats. LaFollette is far closer to Bryan than are any of these men, based on past practices and professions. All of them have at least once opposed Bryan for president; some of them have always opposed him. We recall that Woodrow Wilson two years ago spoke at a public meeting against the naming of Bryan for the presidency and in favor of John A. Johnson, who was then the hope of the conservative east. John A. Dix is the antithesis of Bryan. His campaign was made along precisely the same lines as the republican campaigns in New York that defeated Bryan for the presidency. His first utterance after the campaign was one proclaiming that investors had taken confidence because Roosevelt was defeated. The old cry, so familiar in the Bryan campaigns, Mayor Gaynor said the recent election showed that men of property would hereafter divide equally between the two parties as in Cleveland's time. Another very familiar anti-Bryan statement. Men of property (some property, at least) have always supported Bryan. It all depends upon how much property the New York mayor thinks a man ought to have.

Judson Harmon, a Cleveland man, is now in open and bitter antagonism to Mr. Bryan.

The rumbling protests from the east against Champ Clark as speaker of the next house emphasizes this very point—that the "big business" of the east in the democratic party is radically opposed to the people's fight for progressive ideas. If there be a democratic triumph will it not serve to show the lines of cleavage in the democratic party—to divide the reactionaries from the conservatives—just as has happened in the republican party?

In the republican party the distinction grows clearer. Nothing could show it better than two editorials that appeared last week, one in the News and the other in the Denver Republican. The News gave Roosevelt credit for what he has done in divorcing the republican party from "big business." Its editorial was so fair and so striking that I wish to quote a few sentences:

"Whatever else may be said of Theodore Roosevelt this much all fair men will concede to his honor: He attacked from the White House those corrupt allies of the republican party upon whose money favors the party must depend for its continuance in power.

"But the democracy does not owe Roosevelt any satirical thanks. It ought to be on its knees of humble and sincere gratitude to him.

"He did what all the democrats of the nation were unable to do. He broke the alliance of big business with the republican party. And that is half the victory.

"The other half will be for democrats to achieve—if they can."

Two days later the Republican of this city contained a bitter editorial attack on Roosevelt and his doctrines as announced at Osawatimie, Kan., declaring them to be populism. What could better illustrate the signs of the times, or the fundamental and irreconcilable split that will mark this as an epoch in American politics? WAYNE C. WILLIAMS.

#### CONFERENCE IDEA ABANDONED

The Baltimore meeting will not be a conference, it will be simply a banquet, such as is a common occurrence in all parts of the country. Champ Clark is reported as having advised against a "conference," saying that "a conference of self appointed delegates meeting on the edge of one part of the country would not be wise." Clark's head is level, as usual. According to the revised plans "no resolutions are to be adopted," and "no candidates are to be boomed."

It is asserted that no section of the country will be slighted, but this statement must be taken humorously, for the west and south will not be very largely represented unless it be by senators and members of congress who happen to be in Washington. The east will be there—especially those who think they have been doing the Lord's service in defeating the democratic party.

The keynote will be harmony—to be secured by an unconditional surrender of the party into the hands of the Wall Street financiers and the trusts and railroads which they represent.

### Practical Tariff Talks

The man who has the time to devote to a thorough study of the metal schedule in the Payne-Aldrich bill will be able to get some interesting facts relating to tariff-making. This is the schedule that the republican press pointed to with much pride, asserting that the large reductions in duties made therein were proof that the steel trust had no friends in republican councils. The computation made by the senate committee on finance for the use of inquiring persons shows that there was a reduction of duty on structural iron and steel from 36.75 per cent under the Dingley law to 29.40 per cent under the new law. This statement was repeated later by the president in the Winona speech that cost the republicans untold thousands of votes at the last election. It also included the declaration that there was an average reduction of duty on this schedule of 2½ per cent, whereas the fact was carefully concealed wholly or in part that rates were actually raised on structural steel, razors, nickel alloys, bottle caps and a few other items of general use.

Neither Mr. Aldrich in his committee computations, Mr. Payne in his speech of defense nor President Taft was fair with the people in discussing the structural steel paragraph, because the facts here stated were known to them. They cannot, therefore, be acquitted of the charge of intent to deceive. This structural steel item, if one is not versed in the uses made of this product, apparently does show a decrease. Here is how the deception was worked. Under the old law the rate on structural steel "whether plain or punched or fitted for use," was \$10 a ton. The house changed this duty to read \$6 a ton. In the senate the rate was fixed on structural steel at from \$6 to \$8 a ton according to the value of the iron. In that form it was adopted. Apparently, therefore, there is a reduction on structural steel, as claimed. Actually there is a large increase, because Aldrich struck out the words "whether plain, punched or fitted for use," and inserted instead these words, "not assembled or manufactured or advanced beyond hammering, rolling or casting."

In other words, the schedule was tinkered with so as to provide no particular or specified duty for structural steel in the only shape in which the man who is erecting a building can use it. The ordinary reader would not understand that structural steel "not advanced beyond hammering, rolling or casting" was not fitted for use, or that in order to make it available to place in buildings it must be punched and otherwise prepared. The substitution for the words "plain or punched or fitted for use" threw the item into what is known as the basket schedule, which fixes a 45 per cent duty on "all manufactures of metal not specifically mentioned." Mr. Aldrich took care that manufactured and ready-for-use structural steel was not specifically mentioned. That this was done for the express purpose of aiding the steel trust is shown by the fact that it is only in recent years that this class of building construction has become necessary and desirable. Increasing the duty just when the consumption was increasing by leaps and bounds demonstrates that such an increase is indefensible, because the only purpose of protection, we are told, is to stimulate languishing manufactures. Twenty-six million dollars worth of this sort of steel is used yearly in this country, and practically all of it is furnished by American manufacturers, the only exceptions being where builders couldn't wait their turn at the factories.

Mr. Taft, repeating what Mr. Payne had said, asserted that the increased duties in the steel schedule were on articles the aggregate consumption of which in this country was only about eleven millions of dollars a year. On the one item of structural steel, a consumption value of more than twenty-six millions of dollars was involved. Structural steel, it may be stated, brings a market price of from \$30 to \$40 per ton. A duty of 45 per cent would mean a tax of from \$13.50 to \$80 a ton. The old rate being \$10 a ton, it is apparent that the increase is from 35 to 80 per cent, depending on the value of the material. C. Q. D.