

# The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 7. No. 11.

Lincoln, Nebraska, March 29, 1907.

Whole Number 323.

## CONTENTS

OUR DUAL GOVERNMENT  
THE STEAL IN STEEL  
RUSSIAN REFORM  
REAL INFIDELITY  
THINGS "ULTIMATE" AND THINGS IMMEDIATE  
GENERAL LEE'S EXAMPLE  
MOVEMENT AGAINST THE ROCKEFELLER SUBSIDY  
THE DEMANDS OF LABOR  
CALAMITY! AND FROM NEW YORK  
PARAGRAPHIC PUNCHES  
COMMENT ON CURRENT TOPICS  
HOME DEPARTMENT  
WHETHER COMMON OR NOT  
NEWS OF THE WEEK

### THE STEAL IN STEEL

The United States Steel (or Steal) company has issued its statement for 1906 and from this statement it appears:

First—That the gross sales were \$696,756,926.01.

Second—That the company has 202,457 employes.

Third—That the employes received last year \$147,765,540.

Fourth—That the net earnings for the year amounted to \$156,624,273.18.

From these figures it will be seen that the net earnings amount to about 23 per cent of the gross sales. Can the average business man do that well when he has no monopoly?

It will also be seen that the net earnings exceed the wages paid to employes. That means that each employe earns what is paid to him and in addition to that earns a profit for his employer more than equal to his wages. The company makes more than one hundred per cent profit on the wages paid; can the ordinary business man do that well when he has no monopoly?

The employes receive in wages about 21 per cent of the gross sales and yet the average tariff is about 50 per cent. What need has the steel company of the tariff which it now enjoys? And how long will the American people wait for the tariff to be reformed by its beneficiaries? Will the average business man who has no monopoly continue to vote with managers of the Steel trust?

### IN A BAD WAY

The republican party is now in such straits that it has just one man whom it regards as popular enough to be the candidate for president. Is there any parallel in history to a situation in which a party hinges its success on one man, and when that man is one who has had the courage to drop his own platform and adopt that of the opposition party?

The republican party has claimed a monopoly of intelligence, while it has fostered a monopoly of everything else. Isn't it strange that with all the brains it claims to have, it has no other popular man in the party?

### THINK OF THIS

It is worth while to note that the main effect of the new interstate commerce law, so far, has been to enable the railroads to keep the rebates that they used to pay to favored shippers. This puts all the shippers on the same footing, but what benefit has it brought to the public which pays the rates? The states, however, have been reducing passenger rates from 3 cents to 2 cents, a reduction of 33 1-3 per cent, and the public gets the benefit. No wonder the railroads prefer federal to state control.



THE TABLES TURNED

## OUR DUAL GOVERNMENT

Jefferson's second reason for supporting state governments in all their rights was that they were the surest bulwark against anti-republican tendencies. Those anti-republican tendencies exist today, and the bulwark cannot be dispensed with.

While popular government is growing stronger all over the world, there are still those in this country who distrust the people. There are many prominent men who regard Hamilton as the greatest of the political thinkers of his day, although his statesmanship cannot be considered independently of the views embodied in his plan of government. There are those who are constantly irritated by the limitations which the constitution has placed upon the sphere of the federal government, and who resent the independence of the state in its local affairs. This very irritation ought to be a warning; if there are those who are irritated because they cannot override the wishes of the community, what would be the irritation in the community if the wishes of its members were overridden? A systematic absorption of power by the federal government would not only cause discontent and weaken the attachment of the people for the government, but a withdrawal of power from the state would breed indifference to public affairs—the forerunner of despotism.

The exercise by the federal government of restraining power is not so objectionable as the exercise of creative power, but even in the exercise of restraining power care should be taken to preserve to the states the exercise of concurrent authority, so that the state government, as well as the national government, can stand guard over the rights of the citizen.

The demand for the enlargement of the powers of the federal government comes from two sources, viz., from those who believe with Hamilton in

the theory of centralization, and from those who want legislation which the state's rights doctrine obstructs. Of these two classes the last is most influential, because the members of this class impart to their method the strength supplied by the object aimed at. An abstract theory seldom provokes discussion, but wars have been fought over a theory embodied in a concrete issue.

First, there is the effort to secure the national incorporation of railway and industrial enterprises. Those who desire this hope for an act of congress and a favorable court decision sustaining it. They could hardly hope for the adoption of an amendment to the constitution. The national incorporation of business enterprises is sought in order to avoid state courts and state regulation, but in view of the growing sentiment against monopolies the subject will hardly reach the courts for it is not likely that a majority of congress can be brought to favor any enlargement of the power of commercial corporations.

A second argument has recently been made in favor of extending the sphere of the general government, viz., that it is necessary to do so to protect the treaty rights of foreigners. Some have even gone so far as to assume that congress has power to carry out the terms of a treaty without regard to constitutional provisions. This is a very palpable error, for the president and senators who join in the making of a treaty are bound by oath to support the constitution, and they can make no binding treaty which violates the constitution. A constitution which can only be amended by the concurrence of the people of three-fourths of the states cannot be suspended by the mere concurrence of the president and the senate.

The exclusion of Japanese students from certain of the schools of San Francisco aroused the discussion in regard to the treaty rights of the