

proceedings have been instituted and he has not even been censured by that or any other court, or by any railroad lawyers.

The criticisms of Judges Schauk and Price of the Ohio supreme court were prepared and first published by the brotherhood of railway trainmen, the Ohio federation of labor, the order of railway conductors, brotherhood of locomotive engineers and other labor organizations.

When the members of these organizations realized that Mr. Thatcher's profession had been taken from him for participating in their cause, they at once rallied to his support and caused a bill to be introduced at the last session of the Ohio legislature, providing that he should have the right to practice law in Ohio.

The bill met with such favor in the senate and house that it was passed with but twelve dissenting votes out of an entire membership in the senate and house of one hundred and fifty-three.

The bill became a law by limitation of time. Since the decision of the supreme court two of its members have stood for re-election and were defeated by the people at the polls.

The legislature has also passed an act, which provides for a non-partisan judiciary, with a view of making it necessary that all candidates for a judicial position shall stand on their merits and not have a party ticket to carry them through.

**NEWTON D. BAKER**

The logical successor of Tom L. Johnson has been nominated as the democratic candidate for mayor of Cleveland. Newton D. Baker has Johnson's ideals for "a city set on a hill." He is filled with the enthusiasms that inspired Johnson. He grasps the fundamental principles of democracy that guided Johnson. He has the abilities, the temperament, the training and the experience to equip him for leadership in carrying out Johnson's civic policies sanely and progressively; and in every respect he possessed Johnson's confidence to the uttermost.

Tom L. Johnson was too much of a democrat to impose post mortem obligations of political leadership upon his followers. He knew that as political conditions change methods also must change, and that individuals useful at one stage may become useless or inimical at another. The people at any given time must be free to judge—free from even the influence of a departed personality. This is democracy. But Tom L. Johnson's confidence in Newton D. Baker as personal friend, as professional adviser, as political lieutenant, was steadfast to the last moment of his life; and the democratic voters of Cleveland have now registered their confidence in the man in whom Johnson confided. Though Baker was not the only one of Johnson's trusted lieutenants, he was that one of them to whom the other trusted ones turned for leadership when Johnson's leadership was over. They know, as did all who understood Tom L. Johnson, that if circumstances had demanded that Johnson name his own successor, he would have named Newton D. Baker. What is more, they knew Baker as the man whom in those circumstances Johnson ought to have named.

Though inspired by the same ideals as Tom L. Johnson, Newton D. Baker was not and is not a blind follower. In taking up the work from which Johnson has been called away, he takes it up as his own duty and not as another's. He is a man who as leader will lead upon his own initiative, who as a builder will build upon his own responsibility. Though his face turned often and lovingly toward the shrine of the lost leader at whose side he loyally stood in many a hot battle against privilege, it will be, as indeed that leader would have had it, not to worship the memory of a mortal, but to draw stimulus anew for the service of a cause. A majority of the democratic voters of Cleveland knew what the occasion demanded when they nominated Newton D. Baker to succeed Tom L. Johnson; we must wait to see, yet of the result there ought to be no room for doubt, if a majority of all the voters of Cleveland will be as wise.—The Public.

**A DOUGLAS PREDICTION**

The late Judge J. H. Broady of Lincoln, Neb., once received a letter from Charles Neely of St. Paul, Minn., from which letter this interesting bit of unwritten history is taken: The pioneers of Illinois were accustomed to meet once a year in Chicago for a good visit and incidentally they would drift into political discussions. In 1861 the following named distinguished men met by agreement at the Tremont house in Chicago: Judge Stephen A. Douglas,

General John A. Logan, 'Long John' Wentworth, William H. Gilman, Alexander Neely and Dr. R. S. Malony. When they were about to separate and return to their respective homes they were in the parlor of the hotel and I was present with my father. Judge Douglas said: 'Now that you are going I want to make a prediction. This government is fast drifting away from the masses and will soon become a money power. That power will be located at Washington and Wall street, and it will soon control the votes of our country. Some of you gentlemen may not live to see this come true, but this young man (referring to me) may do so.' General Logan replied: 'Judge Douglas, I fear what you say is too true.' All the gentlemen present have since passed away, and I am the only living witness."

**Practical Tariff Talks**

The justification which President Taft in his Grand Rapids speech puts forward for his veto of the woolen bill is that it was not the same bill to which the committee on ways and means gave careful consideration, but was a hybrid; and that he was without accurate information as to whether the rates were justified by the facts. A careful comparison of the facts with the rates, however, was possible for the president, because those facts are contained in the congressional debates and in the reports of the committee on ways and means. The truth is quite plain, and that is that the president would not sign the bill because of its democratic origin, and because he is opposed to any tariff revision that is not made just the way he wishes it accomplished. In the speeches of Senators Dolliver and La Follette during the 1909 session and in the summary issued by the democratic ways and means committee at the time of the introduction of the last bill in the house are contained every vital and important fact upon which his tariff board will report.

The congressional debates of the special session of 1909 established the uncontradicted fact that the present schedules discriminate against the independent woolen manufacturers who make the cheaper clothes of the multitude and in favor of the woolen trust by establishing a fixed and unvarying ratio of shrinkage, the effect of which is to cause the user of the heavier shrinkage wools to pay a tariff tax almost double that of the user of the lighter shrinkage stuff. Yet the president sees nothing in this to cause him any concern, because he vetoed a bill that reduced this discrimination by reducing the amount of the tariff on raw wool from 11 cents a pound to 29 per cent, or approximately half. The existing schedules attempt to compensate the American manufacturer for the greater amount he must pay for his raw wool under the tariff than if there were none at all, by levying a duty upon the cloth imported additional to that which is known as a protective duty.

The evidence before congress—and known of the president if he has given the wool schedules the study and consideration to which they are entitled—is to the effect that this compensatory duty is more than twice as much as the sum which is paid out by the manufacturer because of the levying of a duty on raw wool. If the purchasing agent of a railroad company pocketed half of the money given into his custody for the buying of rails because the price he paid for the rails was but half of the sum it was supposed he would have to pay he would be accused of a misappropriation of funds. When the manufacturer of woolen cloths in this country puts into his pocket twice the sum that he has induced the law-makers to believe he must pay out additional for his wool because those law-makers place a duty upon it, where lies the difference?

President Taft is aware that the bill which he vetoed cut out this graft by eliminating the compensatory duty entirely. Yet because congress, out of a desire to relieve the clothing users of this country from a burden most difficult to bear, refused to wait until his tariff board or commission had confirmed the fact that the compensatory duty under the present law represents double the excess duty paid by reason of a raw wool tariff, the president vetoes the bill proposed. The average duty on woolen cloths imported is a little less than 100 per cent. The bill which the president vetoed cut this rate

to an average of 49 per cent. The reports of the experts of the census bureau placed on file year after year, show the total labor cost in the woolen industry to be less than 25 per cent of the total cost.

This means that for every dollar the manufacturer paid out to produce his goods he paid to labor 25 cents. The proposed bill, remember, put the protection at 49 per cent. Yet the president says: "I had no adequate information and was furnished none upon which I could say that the bill presented to me was in accord with the republican platform upon which I was elected and to which I am in honor bound to square my official act and policy." That platform, let it also be remembered, decreed that the measure of every protective duty was that it should represent the difference in labor cost here and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to the manufacturer. When the entire labor cost is but 25 per cent, surely a 49 per cent tariff duty can not be rejected because the president had no information as to whether it was in accord with the republican platform. C. Q. D.

**WATCH IT GROW**

Mr. Bryan has given instructions that every new subscriber shall receive The Commoner for a period of two years (which will carry it beyond the presidential election of 1912) for the sum of one dollar. Every Commoner reader is asked to secure at least one new subscriber. Many will be able to secure more than one. Everyone, however, may render some aid in this work.

The following named readers have sent in new subscribers: Jay Collins, Okla.; M. P. Murphy, Ia.; G. W. Moles, Mo.; C. W. Martens, S. D.; Warren G. Brown, N. H.; G. W. McWherter, Tex.; E. W. Morris, W. Va.; Jacob A. Harris, W. Va.; Jno. R. Yates, Mont.; T. P. Huff, Tex.; Chas. Huston, O.; Hans Hargen, N. D.; O. P. Carswell, Tex.; Arne Swennes, Minn.; C. T. Morehead, Ky.; C. French, Cal.; J. M. Simpson, Wash.; J. O. Pennington, O.; G. W. Frederick, O.; Jno. W. Chambers, Ala.; Jas. W. Schooler, Ind.; S. Burrows, Ia.; D. W. Knight, W. Va.; Wm. W. Clemens, Ill.; R. A. Borden, N. J.; F. A. Osborn, N. J.; Ed. O. Donnell, Minn.; G. L. Giersa, Mo.; Dennis Brosnan, Mich.; H. G. Vengert, Ia.; C. B. Knowlton, O.; C. H. Reeves, O.; Thos. H. Dennis, Del.; W. H. Greenwell, Del.; H. B. Carr, Tex.; Louis Cunningham, O.; A. W. Davis, Ind.; R. S. Breeden, Tenn.; J. M. Lewis, W. Va.; Dr. P. V. Murray, Pa.; P. C. Kent, Mo.; T. F. Harrison, Ind.; Henry Bouwens, Mich.; H. M. Woodford, Ky.; F. E. Teed, N. Y.; Henry W. Brown, Mass.; A. H. Shoemaker, O.; Jno. J. Driscoll, La.; E. C. Foltz, Ind.; H. L. Woll, N. D.; G. N. Stivene, Ky.; A. S. Bracy, O.; M. V. Wright, O.; E. M. McIntosh, Okla.; Jos. Williams, Wash.; Jno. Reese, Ill.; R. Tweddle, La.; W. M. Craig, Mo.; E. A. Tuttle, Tex.; T. N. Dunphy, Mo.; J. R. Holt, Ark.; Jno. A. Barnett, Ind.; S. A. Goss, O.; Alex. Johnson, N. D.; Chas. F. Limbacher, O.; W. A. Corley, Neb.; R. F. Whiting, W. Va.; E. W. Morris, W. Va.; J. M. Ragan, Mo.; F. P. Ditte, Kan.; Thos. Majoe, Wash.; C. K. Ferris, Wash.; A. R. Galloway, N. Y.; J. E. Caldwell, Wash.; W. L. Knox, Wash.; N. Nish, Ia.; W. A. Bynum, La.; J. D. Campbell, Cal.; T. J. Vandergrift, O.; Levi Essick, O.; J. N. Sheet, Ala.; W. T. Nordlin, Mont.; D. J. Vaughn, Wyo.; G. F. Gould, Me.; B. P. McNulty, Pa.; M. Quigley, Minn.; J. B. Eagan, N. Y.; Jno. F. Stone, Pa.; J. Chamberlin, Cal.; D. D. Tanner, Tex.; C. H. Wintersteen, Mo.; Perry A. Heater, Mont.; W. P. Priddy, Mo.; D. Nichols, Wash.; H. W. Ballard, Ala.; W. M. Cason, Miss.; Lewis N. Larrabee, Ind.; Edwin Currey, W. Va.; Chas. H. Muers, N. Y.; A. F. Coghill, Okla.; W. J. Dukes, Md.; Jas. Larch, Ore.; S. E. Bailor, Mo.; J. P. Wales, Ia.; Jas. McGlashan, O.; R. E. Brehann, O.; C. W. Wright, Ind.; Martin H. Wallace, R. I.; O. W. Bastian, Pa.; R. I. Harper, Tex.; Henry Clark, Neb.; F. M. Fox, Ida.; E. G. Sackett, Fla.; C. H. Gilmer, Va.; D. R. Reitsma, Ore.; D. Lyphe, Wash.; Wm. Carroll, O.; A. R. Miller, Ia.; Herman Clothier, Ind.; S. F. Darwin, Wash.; E. A. Walrath, Neb.; O. J. Rife, W. Va.; Herman Goldberger, Mass.; J. E. Miller, Ill.; Richard Kenteriz, S. D.; F. R. Whitcomb, Cal.; Thos. L. Patterson, O.; J. T. Hayes, Cal.; Wm. H. Ogilvie, Wis.; R. F. Stevenson, Pa.; W. F. Humphreys, Va.; A. S. Winford, Miss.; Jno. McCarthy, Colo.; J. W. Hughes, N. Y.; T. J. Watkins, Tenn.; J. C. Obrien, Mich.; W. A. Stead, S. D.; I. C. Anderson, Ind.; H. R. Dickinson, Mich.; E. C. Carrington, O.; J. F. Glick, Kan.; H. Flygore, Minn.; Bettie Tatlow, Mo.; J. L. Whittemore, Mass.; B. D. Perkins, Nev.