

The Commoner.

ISSUED WEEKLY.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN Editor and Proprietor.
 RICHARD L. METCALFE Associate Editor.
 CHARLES W. BRYAN Publisher.
 Editorial Rooms and Business Office 224-226 South 12th Street

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

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| One Year - - - - \$1.00 | Three Months - - - - 25c |
| Six Months - - - - .50 | Single Copy - - - - 5c |
| 11 Clubs of Five or more. | Sample Copies Free. |
| Per Year - - - - .75 | Foreign Postage 52 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.

seems to me to be the plain truth of this situation, and be thrown off my feet and stampeded because some one exhibits the specter of the steel trust. I must be controlled in my action by facts as I see them, and not by the fear of some remote and improbable danger.

Again, Mr. President, this further fact stands out and can not be overlooked: Enormous iron ore deposits have been recently discovered and are now being rapidly developed on the northern coast of Cuba. These great properties have been acquired, ostensibly, at least, by the Bethlehem and the Pennsylvania steel companies. These ores can be mined cheaper in Cuba than in this country, and they can be shipped to our seaports by water at a comparatively light transportation charge. Therefore it is altogether probable that the great bulk of foreign ores coming to the states will come from these Cuban mines, owned, as I have said, by the Bethlehem and Pennsylvania steel companies. In the management of these companies, at least of the Bethlehem, Mr. Schwab is a central and commanding figure. And who is Mr. Schwab? He was educated in the iron and steel industry under the tutelage of Andrew Carnegie, and he was at the head of the great Carnegie works when they were sold to the trust. He received pay for his stock in the Carnegie plant, amounting to millions, in the stocks and securities of the steel corporation, and therefore for a long time served as the president of the great corporation known as the "trust." Several years ago he retired from the presidency of that corporation to take charge and direction of the Bethlehem establishment. But does anyone suppose that he has severed his connection with the trust; that he no longer holds its stock and securities in large amounts, or that he is not still intimately connected and vitally interested in that stupendous organization? Are there any so credulous as to imagine that the corporation with which Mr. Schwab is at this time immediately and prominently identified is independent? Rather is it not more reasonable to suppose that these Schwab enterprises are in some way allied with the greater corporation? Mr. President, while I can not speak with knowledge, I have little or no doubt that when Mr. Schwab's Cuban mines begin to empty their ores into our markets the trust will share with the Schwab company in whatever benefits may accrue. It seems to me, therefore, that free ore would work no harm to any of these great establishments, but would be of greater benefit to them than to anybody else. As I view this subject, I would not be willing to give free admission to the foreign products of these great corporations.

Instead of giving to them this foreign raw material free, I believe it wiser and better to

require them to contribute something to the treasury on their importations. It is true that, reckoning on the basis of importations made in former years and assuming that the importations will not be increased in future, the revenue would not exceed \$250,000; but, Mr. President, it is asserted with plausibility and with apparent good reason that when the Schwab mines in Cuba are fully developed and importations from those mines begin, that there will be millions of tons of ore imported every year; and if that expectation shall be realized, then the revenue produced therefrom would amount to several millions of dollars. I think it better to put that money in the treasury than to leave it in the pockets of Mr. Schwab and his associates.

Mr. President, these are the reasons which induced me to vote to impose this slight revenue duty on imported iron ores. The senior senator from Maryland (Mr. Rayner) read a clause from the Denver platform in which the democratic convention declared, in substance, that trust-controlled productions should be put on the free list. I subscribed to that declaration when it was written, and I was on the platform committee, and I subscribe to that declaration now. Others may interpret the declaration differently, but, to my thinking, it has no possible application to the case in hand. In saying that trust-controlled articles should be put on the free list, the convention did not intend to declare, and in fact did not declare, that the raw material of a trust, or in which a trust is interested, made abroad, should be admitted free through our ports to be manufactured in this country into products highly protected. An interpretation of that kind would be wholly at variance with the purposes the convention had in mind when the platform was promulgated.

So, Mr. President, while I do not in the least criticize any democratic senator who took the other view and stood for free ores, I do not believe that those of us who voted for the duty made a mistake, nor do I think we in the least degree ignored the obligation, if there be any obligation—and I think there is—imposed upon those of us who hold commissions from democratic constituencies to support the declarations of our national platform. I do not hold myself above criticism from any source, and I do not object to criticism when fairly made; and so in this instance I do not protest against Colonel Bryan expressing his opinion, but I think we understand the situation here better than he does, and that we understand these questions fully as well as he does, and hence the confidence I have in the correctness of my vote has not been shaken by the expressed view of my distinguished friend.

SENATOR DANIEL ON PROTECTION

The Times-Dispatch published at Richmond, Va., is not a safe guide on all questions, but it speaks with wisdom and with force in its criticism of Senator Daniel's speech on quebracho. The Times-Dispatch points out the error into which Senator Daniel has fallen. He has voted to allow nine Virginia factories to tax two million Virginians and some ninety millions outside of Virginia. As a kindergarten student in the school of protection the senator may think that he can secure an advantage for the manufacturers of quebracho without favoring tariff on other things, but before his schoolmasters give him a high tariff diploma they will teach him that he must be ready to swallow any tariff that is asked by his co-log-rollers. The Times-Dispatch editorial, will be found below:

SENATOR DANIEL'S POLICY

Candor is under all circumstances a commendable quality. When Senator Daniel rises in the senate and tells the country bluntly that he is a protectionist he must impress many persons as being more candid than some of his colleagues. If votes mean anything, many of the democrats in the senate are protectionists, in one direction or another, in greater or in less degree. But they have been careful to evade any adoption of the label. Senator Daniel deserves credit for kicking away all pretexts and pretenses and displaying the full courage of his convictions. But how he would reconcile these convictions with those of the party which sent him to the senate to voice convictions of a contrary sort is quite another matter.

Quebracho, the bark extract which tanners use, is manufactured considerably in Virginia. A high duty on this product, though it may further hasten the driving of the American tanning industry into Canada, would undoubtedly help nine Virginia factories. It is certain, therefore, that Senator Daniel's position will command many supporters. Among these we note already our able neighbor, the News-Leader, which tells its readers that "Senator Daniel is

exactly right in his position on the tariff." Rather inappropriately, it would seem, the News-Leader adds a re-statement of its blanket defense of democratic high protection during the present session: "The protective tariff system is wrong and bad, but while it is forced on us and we are compelled to pay its penalties we ought to demand our share of its profits." Senator Daniel is thus provided with exactly the sort of prop he has himself deliberately rejected.

Did Mr. Daniel really "demand" that this Virginia product be protected at the public expense on the ground that the protective system "is forced on us?" We search the dispatches in vain for any hint of this worn argument. On the contrary, we find that he has himself given us his reasons for his demand, and that these reasons are altogether different. "I want to protect American interests," he said with praiseworthy honesty. "That is my policy. I don't care what name you call it. I am for it." This is protection from policy, not from force. Holding to this policy, as here authoritatively described, the senator could hardly be pictured, if the democratic party suddenly found itself in control of tariff legislation, as rising to demand that the duty on quebracho be removed.

What are these "wrong and bad" "profits" of protection of which good democrats ought to demand a share? If the protective system brings profits to the people generally, why is it wrong and bad? If, on the contrary, it is wrong and bad because it gives profits to the few at the expense of the many, why should a fresh extension of it be supported by official democratic spokesmen?

The difficulties which the most intelligent minds have in grappling with questions such as these seem to be well illustrated by the News-Leader. One bit in our neighbor's argument is so typical of the pains of harmonizing two conflicting positions that we may be pardoned for reproducing it at some length:

"Senator Daniel's position is wise from a political as well as from a commercial and material point of view. If these hundreds of working Virginia citizens and voters found themselves thrown out of their jobs and deprived of their incomes because the democratic party as an abstract proposition holds the theory of free trade, they would lose no time in seeking vengeance and asserting their own interests by voting with the republicans. Free quebracho and chestnut extract might mean a few cents' cheapening of a set of harness, a side of leather or a pair of shoes; but this lessening of cost would be of little advantage to the thousand or so men thrown out of work and yet compelled to pay the tariff tax on their clothes and hats, tools and food."

If we pause to analyze this paragraph, we appear to find that the argument rests upon three general principles:

1. That it is wise for democratic senators to adopt quasi-republican positions in order to mollify democrats and keep them from turning republicans.

2. That the cost of living to everybody should not be cheapened if the process would injure a "thousand or so" Virginians.

3. That because 90,000,000 Americans have to pay a "tariff on their clothes and hats, tools and food," a favored 1,000 of these Americans should be encouraged to levy on the other 89,000,000 odd a tariff tax on their shoes also.

The first of these principles involves a general surrender of the democratic party to the republican party. The last two involves as frank an adoption of protection for protection's sake as that which Mr. Daniel appears to have just given. How any of them can be reconciled with democratic principles and policies we can not undertake to say.

Any effort to identify 1,000 Virginia producers of quebracho with the 90,000,000 consumers of taxed goods in this country may safely be dismissed as inconsequential. That the thousand should desire to relieve its burden of taxation by placing fresh burdens upon the ninety million is natural enough. But that democrats should support them in so one-sided a demand is quite another matter. That such democrats, in congress or out, conceive that they are in this way serving their state no one for a moment denies. That they are absolutely mistaken is to our mind equally plain. The News-Leader, which defends the placing of a high duty on quebracho, admits that this may mean an increased price for shoes, leather and harness. There are more than 2,000,000 wearers of shoes in Virginia. There are 1,000 producers of quebracho. To protect quebracho is to help 1,000 Virginians at the expense of 2,000,000 Virginians. Is this really serving the state?