

The Commoner.

ISSUED WEEKLY.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN
Editor and Proprietor.

RICHARD L. METCALFE
Associate Editor.

CHARLES W. BRYAN
Publisher.

Editorial Rooms and Business
Office 324-326 South 12th Street

Entered at the Postoffice at Lincoln, Neb., as second-class matter

One Year \$1.00	Three Months 35c
Six Months 50	Single Copy 5c
11 Clubs of Five or more	Sample Copies Free.
Per Year 75	Foreign Postage 62 Cents Extra

SUBSCRIPTIONS can be sent direct to The Commoner. They can also be sent through newspapers which have advertised a clubbing rate, or through local agents, where sub-agents have been appointed. All remittances should be sent by postoffice money order, express order, or by bank draft on New York or Chicago. Do not send individual checks, stamps or money.

DISCONTINUANCES—It is found that a large majority of our subscribers prefer not to have their subscriptions interrupted and their files broken in case they fail to remit before expiration. It is therefore assumed that continuance is desired unless subscribers order discontinuance, either when subscribing or at any time during the year. Presentation Copies: Many persons subscribe for friends, intending that the paper shall stop at the end of the year. If instructions are given to that effect they will receive attention at the proper time.

RENEWALS—The date on your wrapper shows the time to which your subscription is paid. Thus January 31, 08, means that payment has been received to and including the last issue of January, 1908. Two weeks are required after money has been received before the date on wrapper can be changed.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS—Subscribers requesting a change of address must give OLD as well as NEW address.

ADVERTISING—Rates furnished upon application.

Address all communications to
THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Neb.

BAILEY TALKS RIGHT OUT IN MEETING

The following press dispatch was doubtless particularly gratifying to those American citizens who realize the extent of the lawlessness of the trust magnates:

Washington, D. C., May 13.—Referring directly to the United States Steel corporation, and charging that organization with violating the anti-trust laws of the country, Senator Bailey today, in addressing the senate on the tariff bill, declared that if the officers of the law do their duty the steel trust would be dissolved, and said that he expected eventually to see this done. He added that if the present administration fails in its duty in that respect, the people of the country would choose other officials to represent them, and he declared his firm belief that the officers of the steel corporation would be either imprisoned or made fugitives from justice.

"Just put one of these malefactors of great wealth in the penitentiary and you will see the anti-trust law enforced without further violations," said Mr. Bailey. "Send one of these men who may be found violating either the interstate commerce law or the anti-trust law to the penitentiary and you will stop these violations by others. You can not do it with fines, because when a court fines a trust the trust fines the people, and as long as the punishment is measured in dollars and cents they will continue to violate the law. Men will take the chance of pecuniary loss in the hope of realizing a greater pecuniary gain. Send one of them to the penitentiary and it will work like magic.

"The millionaire," continued Mr. Bailey, who was receiving the rapt attention of the senators on both sides of the chamber, "values one thing more than his fortune, and that is his liberty. He does not love justice. He does not love that peace of mind for which others struggle. But he loves his liberty."

Mr. Bailey said that he expected the United States Steel corporation will be dissolved. Continuing, he said:

"I expect to see its officers imprisoned or become fugitives from justice, and men now charged with the administration of the law fail to conform to their demands. I have an abiding faith that the American people will call into their service another set of men from your party. The stalwarts of today would become the insurgents of that day and the insurgents of this generation would be the stalwarts of the next generation. That is as certain as any event in the future can be."

Some of the Mysteries of Tariff Making

A Republican Senator Points Out Some of the Absurdities of the Republican Party's "Sacred Policies"

Following are extracts from the speech delivered in the United States senate by Senator Dolliver (Rep.) of Iowa:

The protective tariff system has nothing to fear from the fireside of the Iowa homestead. On the other hand, it finds there its most disinterested advocates and its most impartial judges. For half a century our people have defended it with their votes on every election day, with no direct concern of any large significance in any of its schedules and no purpose to serve except the general prosperity of the American people.

What I have said of Iowa is true, in an important sense, of the upper Mississippi valley, and I can not help thinking that there is a radical defect in that party leadership which dismisses the voice of that great community, fearlessly expressed in both houses of congress, with a cynical sneer about the weakness of public men who are governed by temporary political exigencies. For it ought not to be forgotten that what we are doing here must be submitted to the American people—a jury of unnumbered millions, already impanelled, with this case under consideration. It is not the same jury which passed upon the tariff act of 1897; it is the most momentous fact in our national life, as the late Senator Hoar suggests in his "Autobiography of Seventy Years," that within this period the whole field of American industry has undergone a revolution. The independent workshops of American labor stand no longer as they appeared in the magnificent vision of Alexander Hamilton when he laid down the doctrine that the competition of domestic producers would guard the community against all the evils of extortion. The inspiring retrospect of Mr. Blaine in his "Twenty Years of Congress," in which he recounted the triumphs of the protective doctrine in the perfect fulfilment of Hamilton's prediction, already needs a good deal of revision to bring the narrative up to date.

The Situation in 1897

In 1897, when the Dingley tariff law was enacted, the consolidation of our industrial system into great corporations had not fairly begun. The business men who appeared before the ways and means committee of the house were an anxious company; they spoke for silent factories and the dead ashes of furnaces without fire and chimneys without smoke. They represented unemployed labor and idle capital; they belonged to the old industrial regime, now almost obsolete in nearly all great departments of production, and they received the treatment which they would receive now freely at my hands if I had the power to give it to them. It is a grim failure to comprehend what old Dr. Johnson used to call "the sad vicissitudes of things" when the leaders of a political party summon their followers to practically re-enact the tariff of 1897 under the conditions which prevail today, and when men are derided because, having helped to frame that law, they seek to have it re-examined in the light of present-day experience.

Is it possible that a man, because he voted for the Allison tin-plate rate of 1889 and heard poor McKinley dedicate the first tin-plate mill in America, can be convicted in this chamber of treachery to the protective tariff system if he desires that schedule re-examined, after seeing the feeble enterprise of 1890 grown within a single decade to the full measure of this market place, organized into great corporations, overcapitalized into a speculative trust, and at length unloaded on the United States Steel company, with a rake-off to the promoters sufficient to buy the Rock Island system? If a transaction like that has made no impression upon the mind of congress, I expose no secret in saying that it has made a very profound impression on the thought and purposes of the American people.

The Special Duty of Congress

I repeat, therefore, what I said the other day, that the duty of this congress is to reduce the margin of protection provided in the Dingley rates wherever it can be done without substantial injury to the productive enterprises of this market place. It is our special duty to take up those schedules which represent the largest investments of protected capital and at least take out of them the rates that are now everywhere

known to be extravagant and unnecessary, which rise so far above the level of our real industrial needs as to bring the policy of protection into ridicule without doing anybody any sort of good. I recognize the peculiar preparation of the senator from Rhode Island for that work. He has already successfully applied sound principles to some of the excesses of the iron and steel schedule. I do not know that he has gone far enough, but he certainly has gone in the right direction. He has failed, in my judgment, in those schedules which relate to the textile industries, and it becomes the duty of somebody not helplessly preoccupied with local interests to bring this failure to the attention of the senate and of the American people. I need not add that in doing so I shall speak with perfect good will for those who differ from me and with perfect charity to those whose unconscious political bigotry makes it hard for them to recognize, even in the senate chamber, those rights of free opinion without which our deliberations are a humbug and a fraud.

A Scale of Duties Twenty Years Old

Turning now to the duties on yarns and woven and knit fabrics of wool, I desire to call the attention of the senate to the abuses which have grown into the schedules, many of them without the knowledge or consent of the finance committee of the senate. I spoke the other day about the difficulty of understanding these schedules and alluded to evidence now at everybody's hand that they were so complex and unintelligible that only one man on the committee was able to comprehend them. My friend from Rhode Island was instantly on his feet to say that it was not the woolen schedule but the duty on tops that bewildered the late Senator Allison and the late Senator Platt of Connecticut, two trained and alert students of our practical affairs, whose names do not suffer by comparison with the greatest statesmen who have illustrated the intellectual dignity of American public life. In the name of sense, if these men could not understand the top question, what excuse is there for seeking to belittle the efforts of others who in trying to serve their own day and generation are engaged in exposing the trickeries that in the course of a half century have found hiding places throughout the woolen schedules?

The chief fault to be found with this schedule of the pending bill lies in the fact that it adopts a scale of duties twenty years old without the slightest effort to readjust them so as to mitigate the inequalities which they have imposed upon more than one department of the woolen industry in the United States.

Another Joker

I desire now to speak of some of the morbid and abnormal influences which have gone out from schedule K to vitiate the tariff system of the United States. The high rates imposed throughout the schedule have been peculiarly attractive to laborers in other departments of the textile vineyard, and it is easy to trace the movements of greed in more than one schedule framed to protect these industries. Manufacturers in other textile departments have been persistent in their efforts to get the advantage of the rates on woolen goods. Makers of silks, of cottons and of furs, not satisfied with their own rates, have sought shelter among the slippery provisions of the wool tariff. We have already seen how hospitably the manufacturers of cotton have been received. It takes only a slight investigation of the silk schedules to see how easily that product puts itself into partnership with the enterprise.

The manufacturers of fur garments, not content to gratefully accept the modest 35 per cent accorded them by the present law, have been able to secure here the increase of their rate to 50 per cent, provided they contain no wool. I do not know whether they are entitled to that or not, but I do know that they ought not to be allowed on account of the presence of wool in the lining or elsewhere in the garment to pass over to the wool schedule, where, in addition to the 60 per cent ad valorem, they will enjoy a bogus compensatory of 44 cents per pound on the weight of the whole garment. The root of this abuse lies in schedule K, where