

The Commoner.

ISSUED WEEKLY.

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

WILLIAM J. BRYAN Editor and Proprietor
 RICHARD L. METCALFE Associate Editor
 CHARLES W. BRYAN Publisher
 Editorial Rooms and Business Office 324-350 South 12th Street

One Year.....\$1.00
 Six Months......50
 In Clubs of Five or more, per year... .75
 Three Months..... .25
 Single Copy......05
 Sample Copies Free.
 Foreign Post. 5c 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 21, '09, means that payment has been received to and including the last issue of January, 1909. 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 will be furnished upon application.

Address all communications to

THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Neb.

revenue principle instead of the protection principle.

One idea looks to spasmodic, fitful, uncertain and unequal disturbance of the great producing interests, which far outweigh the manufacturing interests, and the other looks to orderly, consistent, certain and equal treatment of both the producing and the manufacturing interests.

The senator's analysis of platform obligations is complete, masterful and illuminating. A platform demand which clashes with a constituency's demand precipitates a conflict which the conscientious statesman must determine upon his own judgment under his oath of office, and as a representative of the people he must appeal to them for vindication and final decision.

Mr. Bryan pitched the contest upon a broad and impersonal issue entirely above any local or factional interest. Mr. Bailey takes the same high ground. Thus the debate rises to the dignity of real statesmanship and involves the fundamental principles of political economy with respect to democratic tariff policy. The more the question is studied the wider it reaches. This is no merely Texas issue. Mr. Bryan's voluntary visit to the state recognized and emphasized it as a national issue, and the last word will not have been said until the democrats of every state have deliberated and acted. The conclusion will not be authoritatively and formally expressed until the next national democratic convention enunciates its policy and nominates its candidate.

The debate begins among the people, where all discussion should begin, to the end that the people themselves direct the expression of their representatives in convention. The opposing views are advocated by two of the choicest spirits and strongest intellects of the age in the democracy of the union. The theatre of the combat is no less than the nation itself, and it seems assured that wherever democrats are numbered from Maine to California between now and 1912 we are to witness a battle between giants and an irrepressible conflict between ideas of commanding interest and importance to the economic welfare.

SENATOR BAILEY AT HOUSTON

On the evening of September 21 Senator Bailey spoke at Houston where he was greeted by a large and enthusiastic crowd. The Houston (Texas) Post, a Bailey organ, presents the following as the notable sayings of the senator in his Houston speech:

My own doctrine is that in levying our tariff we should assimilate our tax on consumption as nearly as possible to a tax on property so that

in taxing consumption we will emancipate as far as possible the man and woman who have no property and who would, therefore, pay no taxes under a property system of taxation.

I believe in a high tax on silk and no tax at all on calico. I would lay a tax on champagne and I would not lay a tax on coffee. I do not believe it is just or fair to lay the great burden of this government upon those who are not able to bear it.

We are told that unless the sovereign democracy of Texas reverses itself we will have two democratic parties, or else two kinds of democracy in this country, the Texas kind and the other kind. There are different kinds of religion in this world, there are Baptists and Methodists and Presbyterians, and Episcopalians, and Campbellites and Catholics. Any one of these religions is better than no religion at all in this world. But while there are many kinds of religion, there is but one kind of democracy, and that is our kind. Now let's see what the Texas kind of democracy is. It is the kind that lays the tax for the purpose of raising revenue to support the government and for no other purpose, but in laying the tax to raise revenue to support the government it commands us to lay that tax on those who are best able to bear it with the least of inconvenience.

They are complaining at me because I would not vote to take the tax off of the manufacturer's raw material while laying a tax on the manufacturer's finished product; in other words, they are complaining against me because I would not take the tax off of what the manufacturer buys from the people and still they would lay a tax on what the people buy from the manufacturers.

I am willing to take the tax off of iron ore whenever they are ready to take the tax off of what they make out of iron ore.

If you want to punish the trusts, take the tax off of what it sells—that is the way to do it. I have no doubt these other men are perfectly sincere in wanting to punish the trusts, but it is not enough for man to want to do what is right. He must know how to do what is right. And the man who believes that you can punish the trusts by taking the tariff off what it does not intend to sell may be a very good man, but he is not a very wise man.

A man who believes that he renders a patriotic service to the state of Texas by voting for the policies that enable Massachusetts to rob us every year may be very honest but he can not be very wise.

The republicans are divided into two classes. There are wise ones and there are honest ones; but the trouble is the wise ones are not honest and the honest ones are not wise.

Do you believe that it is just and fair for the manufacturer to buy a hide from a Texas farmer or cattleman without a tax and then make that hide up into harness and shoes and send them back here and sell them to that man, Texas cattleman or farmer, with a tax on them? Do you believe that it is right? Some men say it is, but they say it because they have not studied the question.

Under the beneficent policy of free raw material, they would take the tax off hides, out of which the government realized \$2,000,000, and leave the tax on shoes, from which the government collected less than \$30,000. And yet they say I am a protectionist because I want to collect \$2,000,000 for the government on hides.

I will never consent to taking the tax off hides for the benefit of the manufacturers until they take it off of boots and shoes for the benefit of the American people.

I am as good a party man as lives, and I vote the democratic ticket like my party makes me—never scratched one of them in my life—though I have had to hold my nose sometimes when I voted for some of them. For, when the platform commands me to do what I know is wrong, I will not do it. A man who will do wrong to please you will the next time do wrong to help himself.

There never was a more dangerous heresy preached to the people of a representative government than this doctrine of slavish obedience to the platform, right or wrong. If you accepted it, it would divest the legislative power out of the bodies where the law and constitution has conferred it and would invest it in a set of irresponsible conventions which are not qualified to exercise it.

Tell me that I do not faithfully represent you and I will give you back your senatorship, but as long as I keep it I will not violate my oath and betray your welfare. I like to be your senator but I do not love it well enough to violate

my conscience in order to hold that office, and the man who will do that is the last man in this world worthy to hold your office.

I believe in a political convention to nominate a candidate; that is the only way to preserve a party organization. I believe a political convention has a right to declare, and I believe every convention has a right to declare the general principles of the party; but there it ought to stop. A political convention is utterly incapable of prescribing the details of legislation.

It is utterly impossible to adopt a platform in a national convention—a great crowd of delegates, a greater crowd of spectators. The subcommittee reports to the full committee, the full committee reports to the convention, and the convention orders the previous question nine times out of ten, and it passes without one delegate in a hundred knowing what it contains.

I am not trying to convict Mr. Bryan of inconsistency. I am trying to convict him of error.

When a democratic triumph comes, I want it to come as a free-will offering of affectionate confidence on the part of the people of the United States. I believe it is just as immoral to bribe a class of rich men to vote the ticket by promising them exemption from taxation as it is to give a poor wretch a five-dollar bill to do so.

I said many bitter things and it cost me a lot of votes to say them. I am not sorry I said them, but I am not going to say it any more, and I will tell you why. I found it was doing me more harm than it was them. I was willing to lose my office for the privilege of abusing them, but I am not willing to lose my soul to do it. I have not only quit abusing them, but I have actually quit hating them. I don't say I love them, for I do not; but I have quit hating them, and that is all anybody could ask of me, isn't it? And so I put all of them behind me forever and my face is to the future now, and whatever talent God gave me I shall concentrate to the service of my people.

Since the world first took its commercial lesson every one knows enough to know that whenever a man is compelled to sell his goods for a lower price in competitive markets he makes up the loss in the non-competitive markets. In other words, if a Texas mill man is compelled to take less for his lumber in Chicago in consequence of Canadian competition, as soon as he recedes far enough from the Chicago market to be free from the effect of Canadian competition, he proceeds to put up his price. That is human nature. Everybody will do that.

This same Mr. Bryan who demands free lumber for Nebraska from Texas voted for a tax on wheat in Nebraska and Texas. If I must choose between bread and lumber, I take the tax on lumber and I will take it off of bread, wouldn't you? It is better that men have bread than it is to have lumber, because every man, woman and child in America eats bread, and only a fraction of us buy lumber every year.

Benevolence is out of place in legislation; the practice ought to be justice, justice for everybody and favor for nobody. That is my creed and if I have had a favor for anybody it will not be for someone who refuses to do justice to my people. This idea of turning the other cheek is all right in religion, but it will not do in politics. The way to make a man respect you is to assert and maintain the rights of your people.

They charge you a tax on everything that enters into the construction of a home, and yet they wanted us to give them free lumber. If we are going to have free homes, let them be free from roof to cellar; if we are going to have free homes let us make free what we buy from the northern and eastern manufacturers before we make free what they buy from us.

You are paying, the tobacco users of the United States, thirty times as much towards the support of the government on the tobacco they consume as the lumber purchasers were paying on their lumber; and yet in the face of that great and disproportioned burden, they still further reduce the moderate taxes on lumber; yet they add 25 per cent increase to the already high tax on tobacco.

The republican party believes in protection and claims to believe in protection for all classes; the democratic party believes in a tariff for revenue only and believes that every class should pay its fair proportion of that revenue, and the only class in whose favor we would make an exception are the poor, who are the least able to pay the taxes; and yet instead of this ancient and memorial creed of democracy, they now propose a new and strange doctrine, and the doctrine reads like this: A tariff for