

interference with state laws, leaving all questions of the constitutionality of state laws to the state courts with the right of appeal to the United States supreme court?

"21. Are you in favor of the secret caucus?"

"22. Are you in favor of amending the reclamation act so that on all projects where the cost has exceeded the original estimates the time for repaying the government shall be extended sufficiently long so as not to increase the original estimate per year of payment?"

"23. If defeated at the primary will you be an independent candidate at the general election?"

"Very respectfully yours, William C. Hedgpeth, September 25, 1911."

Mr. Hedgpeth has set a good example. Let every democrat in every state in the union submit similar questions to the men who seek office at their hands.

#### "THE SAME OLD MOON IS SHINING IN THE SAME OLD MILKY WAY"

Kansas City Star: A man about thirty years old, rather well dressed, entered the office of G. M. Husser, educational director of the Y. M. C. A., the other day, and said he would like to enter the night school. Mr. Husser gave him a catalogue of the school and told him to pick out the course he desired to take. The man hesitated a moment and then looked at the folder. Finally he turned to Mr. Husser and said: "I can't read."

"Can't read?" replied Mr. Husser.

"Not a line. I can't write, either. You see, my father died when I was very young, and I have had to work hard ever since. I never had time to go to school. So I never learned to read. I didn't seem to care much about not knowing how. I worked hard and earned a living. I suppose if I had had a mother she would have made me learn to read. But I never knew her. I was left all alone early in life.

"But now there is a girl," and the man smiled. "There is a girl at my boarding house that has taken a great deal of interest in me. And—I—I have in her. She brought me a Bible not long ago and told me she wanted me to read in it for fifteen minutes every day.

"I took the book. I couldn't tell her I couldn't read a line in it. She asked me a few days later if I had read any of it. And then I had to tell her. Now, I want to learn how to read as well as anyone, so I can read that Bible as she asked me to do."

The man was put in a special class and will be given instructions in reading and writing.

#### WHAT KIND?

When President Taft said: "I love the judges; I love the courts; they are my ideal on earth and typify what we shall meet afterward in heaven under a just God," did he have in mind the supreme court of the United States that decided the Sherman anti-trust law to mean every restraint of trade, or did he have in mind the supreme court of the United States that decided the Sherman law to mean only those restraints that the judges may regard as reasonable? Did he have in mind a court like the federal court presided over by Judge Sanborn which decides that the states have practically no power to regulate railroad rates; or a federal court like the one presided over by Judge Warrington which decides quite the opposite? When the federal courts exhibit such remarkable differences of opinion as to what constitutes justice, what kind of courts does President Taft have in mind when he says "they typify what we shall afterward meet in heaven under a just God?"—La Follette's Magazine.

#### SOMETHING ABOUT PREVARICATING

The St. Louis Republic printed recently the following editorial: "In debate or in controversy William J. Bryan usually is fair and courteous. Why is it, then, that his smug little weekly is a common scold and a common prevaricator?"

Dr. S. A. Johnson of Nevada, Mo., has written to the Republic with reference to this editorial, saying: "In today's republic, you say, editorially, that Mr. Bryan's Commoner is a common scold and prevaricator. I would like to know if you base your opinion from his statement that you were formerly John R. Walsh's editor of the Chicago Chronicle and stood for all the special interests that were preying upon the people and that had so much preachment to give the dear public about national honor during the campaign of 1896?"

## Practical Tariff Talks

The government has begun action to dissolve the Steel trust. There never would have been a steel trust if it had not been that the government of the United States, which has largely been under the control of the republican party for half a century, erected a system of protective duties which has barred for many years any effective competition from foreign manufacturers of steel and iron. Not only has it barred this competition, but it has levied such high duties that vast fortunes have been heaped into the laps of the steel-makers. At the hearings of the ways and means committee of the house before the passage of the present tariff law, such men as Carnegie, Schwab and Gary admitted that America produces steel cheaper than any other nation, but the two latter insisted that some protection should be retained because if the doors were opened to everybody the independents would suffer. Congress reduced a number of the duties, but not below the prohibitive point in any remembered case.

Briefly examine the steel schedule in the Payne-Aldrich law. In 1907 this schedule produced a revenue of \$22,000,000. Under the new rates this would have been reduced to \$20,400,000, or a little less than 7 per cent. Many of these reductions were made to favor the manufacturer. Iron ore was reduced, but as the steel trust owns about 85 per cent of the ore supply of the country, has leases on a great deal of Canadian ore and owns mines elsewhere, it benefits to the extent of a 25 per cent a ton duty. Railroad iron and steel was reduced 50 per cent, from \$7.84 per ton to \$3.92, but nobody can beat American manufacturers in making rails, none are imported and the reduction in duty hasn't affected prices at all. Structural iron, through a little bit of jugglery, was materially increased, because it had been discovered that somebody who built a skyscraper in New York city had imported his steel beams, and it was necessary that nobody else should be permitted to follow his example. Later it was discovered that he had imported this steel, not because he could save anything by doing so, but because he was in a big hurry for the stuff. But the increased duty remains.

The watch trust insisted that it needed some protection, because it had not been getting all of the trade in the cheaper watch movements. These were increased 16 per cent, and affected about three-quarters of a million dollars worth of importations. Iron and steel manufacturers in hundreds of different varieties, for tools, machinery and the like, are used to the value of many millions each year. These carried a 45 per cent tax under the old law, and this high rate was retained in the present law, although it represents more than double the total labor cost entering into these classes of goods. Some republican, looking for something with which to bolster up the claim that the steel and iron schedule was revised downward, will doubtless present the indisputable fact that forty-six items in that schedule carry lower duties. He can prove beyond any contradiction that five items in the boiler iron classification, ten in the hoop iron list, fourteen in the sheet iron, and seventeen in the steel ingot paragraphs carry reductions.

These total forty-six reductions. By comparing them with the list of importations for 1907 it will be found that the old rate, save on ingots, was so high that very little were imported, and that the reductions in duty on the entire forty-six items was but \$57,000, of which that on ingots represented \$37,000. Another paragraph, covering steel ingots of another classification, carried an increased duty, which, based on the 1907 importation, represented an increase of \$72,000. Forty-six small changes downward were more than offset by this single change upward. The secret of this little mystery lies in the fact that wherever the consumer of manufactured steel was getting the best of it there was an increase; where a reduction would not help him or hurt the manufacturer it was made, largely, for the purpose of being later pointed out as proof that the republican pledge of a downward revision was kept in the Payne-Aldrich law. There are in that law 654 paragraphs in which reductions were made and 220 in which increases were effected. The remainder of the 2024 items, 1150 were left un-

changed. The sample shown from the steel schedule shows how much value attaches to the number of reduced paragraphs argument.

C. Q. D.

#### TAKE WARNING FROM WALL STREET, MR. TAFT

Editorial in Wall Street Journal, October 11th: It would be astonishing if President Taft, under the pressure of his radical friends, should forget to whom he owes his election in 1908. There was not at that time any very clean-cut issue between the parties, but there was a clean-cut conviction in the minds of business men that Mr. Taft represented a different type of mind and character from his opponent, Mr. Bryan. The result was that he received what may virtually be called the unanimous vote of the business community. The evidence of this is found in the great number of votes by which he led the other candidates of the republican party.

In this state, for instance, the Taft plurality was 202,602, while the republican candidate for governor—so worthy a man as Justice Hughes—received a plurality of only 69,000. In Connecticut, the Taft plurality was 44,600, while the republican plurality for governor was less than 16,000. In Ohio, Massachusetts and several other states large majorities for President Taft were accompanied by the election of democratic governors. In some of these states the Taft pluralities were so large that they would not be wiped out even by the deduction of the democratic gains of last fall.

If President Taft was stronger than his party in 1908 it was because the business community gave him their confidence. The alternative was Mr. Bryan and Mr. Bryan's policies, which it was not believed President Taft would adopt. The same issue had kept the republican party in power since the silver contest of 1896, in spite of the sometimes disturbing performances of Mr. Roosevelt. What happens when the business community make up their minds that a party or a candidate is no longer to be trusted was evidenced by the result in this state last autumn.

#### JUDICIAL LEGISLATION

Justice Harlan, of the United States supreme court, in dissenting from the majority opinion in the Standard Oil case, said:

"In the now not a very short life that I have passed in this capital and the public service of this country, the most alarming tendency of this day, in my judgment, so far as the safety and integrity of our institutions are concerned, is the tendency to judicial legislation, so that, when men having vast interests are concerned, and they can not get the law making power of the country which controls it to pass the legislation they desire, the next thing they do is to raise the question in some case, to get the court to so construe the constitution, or the statutes, as to mean what they want them to mean."

The judiciary is the one body that has set itself above the people; the one body that is not responsible to the people. If our self-governing republic shall be turned into an autocracy, it will be of little consolation to know that the dictators wear judicial robes instead of an Augustus' crown, and forms do not concern us; the question at issue is, shall public servants be free from accountability to the people for their official conduct? If they are free from such responsibility, we have no right to the name of republic—Los Angeles (Cal.) Outlook.

#### MR. TAFT IS DISCOURAGED

From President Taft's Chicago speech: "Now we are at—some people think—the crisis in the republican party with reference to its continuance in the guidance of the nation. I am hopeful that the good people of the country, who know a good thing when they see it, have only chastened us in an off-year, in order that we may be better hereafter, but with no intention of shifting from shoulders that are fitted to bear the burdens of the present problems and carry them to a successful solution, to those which are untried and which have new theories of action that we do not believe in, and that we don't believe the people believe in. However, if so be it that they desire to make a change, we shall loyally support the new government under any conditions, with the hope it will inure to the benefit of the country, but with the consolation that, if after one trial the people think they ought to go back to the old party that has served them so well in the progressive days of the nation, they will do so—we can bear that, my friends; that is all."