

dent Taft would select for his cabinet advisers, men who had honor and manhood enough to advise him to keep his campaign pledges.

Judge of their astonishment when they read of the selection of the following:

Knox, the handy man of the steel and other Pennsylvania monopolies.

Nagel, the attorney for the Standard Oil.

"Strict Construction" Ballinger, who believes in the strict construction of every law against the government, and where the interests of private syndicates is involved now under investigation by congress.

Hitchcock, lassoer of delegates and past master of practical politicians.

"Illinois Central" Dickinson and "Swelled Can Goods" MacVeagh, ex-democrats of most exclusive aristocratic and plutocratic predilection.

With such able seamen presiding over the deliberations and destinies of the house and senate and sitting at the president's elbow to advise him in the interests of the dear people, the outcome in the shape of tariff legislation could be easily foretold.

Betrayal of the people and abandonment of campaign pledges was inevitable. It came in the Payne-Aldrich bill, the culmination of republican perfidy and national robbery of the people.

Why this law should have received a hyphenated name is a mystery. Was it because neither of its reputed sponsors cared to accept undivided responsibility? Was it because each wished a partner in crime?

After a little experience the people will prefer to call it the "Pain" bill. For financial pain has fallen upon every man who has bought a suit, a hat, a shirt, or a decent meal since its enactment.

I shall not attempt to properly characterize this law. I shall content myself with pointing out a few of its beauties and peculiarities and then quote the opinions of a few republicans upon the same.

1. Under its beneficent provisions the increased cost to American citizens of men and boys' clothing will be in the year 1910, one hundred and twenty million dollars.

2. The duty on lumber squared with saws is 50 per cent higher in the "Pain" act than under the Dingley act.

3. On different grades of woolen goods the tariff is 123 per cent, 127 per cent and 140 per cent.

4. On the cheapest woolen blankets the duty is 107 per cent.

5. On 8 cent figured unbleached cotton cloth, not exceeding six yards to the pound, the senate raised the duty one cent a yard and classed it as a "luxury."

6. The duty on cotton stockings worth from \$1.00 to \$1.50 per dozen pairs under the "Pain" act has been raised about 30 per cent.

7. Structural steel was outrageously protected under the Dingley act. Yet, under the "Pain" act in some cases the tariff has been still further raised.

8. The outcry of the people against the exactions and impositions of the Dingley law was so insistent that the republican party in its national platform pledged its revision, yet over 67 per cent of the 2,024 items in the Dingley act have been either allowed to remain in the "Pain" act at the same high figures or have been increased. Indeed 220 of the items in the Dingley act have been increased at the demand of the tariff robbers in the "Pain" act. Since the passage of the act the price of clothing has advanced from 20 to 25 per cent.

These are a few of the remarkable features of the "Pain" bill. Yet our republican friends may say that there were some few reductions and some articles were placed upon the free list. This is undeniably true and to enable you to judge of republican liberality and fairness, let me enumerate a few of the articles under the benign influence of republican laws, now on the free list.

Silk bolting cloth used in milling flour, palm-leaf fans, curry powder, shrimps, acorns, lemon and lime juice, tapioca and turtles, life boats, dead men's teeth, skeletons, rags, bones, some kinds of hair, so that we can always be sure of "A rag, a bone and a hank of hair."

The people will much appreciate the fact that such necessities of life as the above have been cheapened to the long suffering public.

Here are some more of the necessities of life given us by the "Pain" bill:

Old brass hoops, bones, dried blood, lava, cuttle fish bone, aconite, nux vomica and arsenic. It may be that the framers of the bill anticipated a crop of suicides as the result of the passage of the bill, and that arsenic might become a household necessity.

Bearing in mind the constantly increasing cost of poultry and eggs, the generous framers of the "Pain" act also placed upon the free list, silk worm eggs, and to crown their efforts in the line of generosity, they finally placed upon the free list, coins of all descriptions, gold and silver bullion and uncut diamonds.

All the American citizen, who finds the cost of living going up beyond his means, has to do if he is short of food, is to import acorns and curry powder.

If he is short on clothes, he will find rags and palm leaf fans on the free list, and if he is short of money or jewels, he will find a tariff on neither coins or uncut diamonds.

I will not quote democratic leaders in criticism of this act. If I did, it might be said that the critics were biased. Let me quote what a few republicans have said:

Senator Cummins of Iowa declared in his Chicago speech of November 6, 1909, that the act recently framed by congress "was not a fulfillment of the party platform," and warned his republican hearers that if the party allowed the act to remain on the statute book and settled down for a period of rest and inaction that "the camp we pitch will be our burial ground."

Senator LaFollette, before the passage of the Payne bill presented to the senate a protest of the National Association of Clothiers, comprising 97 per cent of the leading manufacturers of clothing in the United States, which declared "that the result of the Dingley wool schedule absolutely unchanged in the new law except for the worst has been to reduce the quality and diminish the weight per yard of popular priced clothing, thereby making that clothing less durable."

Competition has to a great extent been eliminated by large and powerful combinations of woolen and worsted manufacturers, who practically fix their own prices and dominate the market.

Since the passage of the act, LaFollette has repeatedly denounced the act as a betrayal of the people and a breach of party good faith.

President Taft in his Winona speech admits: "It is entirely possible to collect evidence to attack any of the schedules." In the same speech he declares: "With respect to the wool schedule I agree that it is too high and that it ought to have been reduced." Again in the same speech he admits: "I am not saying that the tariff does not increase prices in clothing and in building and in the other items that enter into the necessities of life."

This is just what our great leader, Bryan—still great in defeat—has always claimed, and what every other democrat has been claiming for over thirty years.

The fact, solemnly admitted by President Taft, is now being brought severely home to every American citizen. The cost of living during the decade ending 1908, increased 49 per cent in the United States, and within the last year it has been still further enormously increased.

A fourteen-ounce loaf of bread now costs five cents in Chicago. In London, sixteen ounces of bread, made out of American wheat can be bought for 2½ cents. The "Pain" bill puts a 25 per cent tariff on flour.

The price of meats has increased enormously so that many American families are now compelled to do without it. The "Pain" act places a tariff of 27½ per cent on all cattle and about 20 per cent on other live animals.

But even when driven to live on corn meal, the American citizen finds he must face a tariff on that luxury of 20 cents a bushel, and if to dodge that burden he buys potatoes, he then finds a tariff of 25 cents a bushel.

No wonder that the cost of living has increased. The republican party has placed so high a tariff upon the absolute necessities of life, such as food, clothing and building materials that foreign competition has been driven from the American market.

This being accomplished, the lords of finance who furnish the war chest to the republican party have syndicated the domestic manufacturers and fixed prices at "what the people will stand" as it was put by one of the crowd.

So we have the beef trust which not only kills all the cattle and sells all the meat of the country, but also contracts for and buys most of the farm produce of the country, such as butter and eggs, the flour trust, the cotton goods trust, the woolen goods trust, the leather trust, the sugar trust, the oil trust and even the coffin trust.

Under fourteen years of republican rule these trusts have grown so mighty and arrogant that they absolutely control both houses of congress, dictate the appointment of judges, own or con-

trol most of the great metropolitan newspapers and have become a menace to American liberty and happiness.

What justification does President Taft present in defending his action in signing the "Pain" bill? I give it to you in his own words, uttered at Winona: "The interests of the party required me to sacrifice the accomplishment of certain things in the revision of the tariff which I had hoped for in order to maintain party solidarity."

A more shameful admission and excuse never fell from the lips of an American president. It must be remembered that when President Taft made his Winona speech he was not a republican candidate, but was president of the whole people and, when as president he says he sacrificed the accomplishment of a revision downward in the interests of party solidarity he admits that he sacrificed the interests of the whole people he represented as chief magistrate to further the interests of his own party. In other words he betrayed his country for his party.

Surrounded by the advisers which he selected from the ranks of plutocracy and special privilege, he has bent the knee to Aldrich, Cannon and the crew of standpatters who have stood in defiance of decency and public sentiment instead of acting in harmony with that honorable and patriotic element of his party who believe in keeping faith in party platforms and pledges.

As a result a revolt has taken place within the ranks of the republican party. Hundreds of thousands of them have awakened to the fact that a high protective tariff cuts off competition from abroad and encourages the syndication of trusts and monopolies at home, with the result that while wages have within the last twelve years increased only 19 per cent, the cost of living has increased over 50 per cent and that a hungry belly is now threatening the American workman, his wife and children.

Thomas Carlyle declares that a hungry belly was the real cause of the French revolution.

There is no excuse for a hungry belly in this great and fruitful country, and there will be none if the country is wisely governed. But if the present tariff legislation which has produced a small crop of Carnegies, Fricks and Armours on the one side, and a roster of thousands of suicides from destitution in our great cities, on the other side, is allowed to continue, the "hungry belly" which caused the French revolution will soon be here. To avoid such a disaster, there must be a face about in American policy. The dangerous and destroying legislation of the republican party must be repealed and the policy of the democratic party as declared in its national platforms for the last sixteen years must be adopted.

The policy of the democratic party as declared in its last convention at Denver should be rigorously adhered to from this time on. That policy succinctly stated is:

First, Place all articles produced by trusts and monopolies on the free list.

Second, Reduce the tariff upon all the necessities of life and upon goods sold by American manufacturers more cheaply abroad than at home.

The only way to kill a monopoly is to throw its products into competition with open markets of the world. The only way to obtain the necessities of life at a fair figure is to reduce the tariff upon such necessities to the difference in the cost of labor which enters into the production of the same here and abroad.

In the production of cotton goods Senator LaFollette after a most careful investigation declares that the difference in the cost of the labor here and abroad does not exceed 8 per cent. The tariff on these goods is 45 per cent.

Upon a careful investigation, I think it will be found that there is not a strict necessity of life in the production of which the extra cost of labor in this country over the cost of the labor abroad will exceed ten per cent. Yet, under the present tariff laws the tariff on some of these necessities is as high as 140.

If the democratic party will adhere to this program as thus expressed in its latest platform, it can not fail of success. These principles are just and in the real interest of the people and all the arts of Mammon and the "gates of hell" shall not prevail against them.

Rev. H. H. Osterhout, Aitkin, Minn.—I send you a club of fifteen new subscribers. I am glad to help The Commoner in the work it is doing. I believe it is doing more for the best interests and elevation of the people than any of the so-called religious papers.