

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 13, NO. 20

Lincoln, Nebraska, May 23, 1913

Whole Number 644

THE NEW DREADNAUGHT

"Ever since the earliest days men have been building ships. They are still building them, but the ship we are planning is different from the others. Its compass is the heart; its shells carry good will; its missiles are projected by the smokeless powder of love; its captain is the Prince of Peace. I ask you all to drink with me to this new battleship---the ship of friendship. No target can withstand the shots that friendship sends abroad."---Mr. Bryan's toast to the "Ship of Friendship," in bidding good-bye to the foreign peace delegates at the John A. Stewart breakfast given in Washington, May 13.

Sugar in the State of Colorado

It is not often that The Commoner has occasion to differ from its esteemed friend, ex-Senator Patterson, of Colorado, but it feels it its duty to dissent from him in the matter of the sugar schedule.

It is outside of the purpose of this comment to enter into an argument upon the merits of the case. It is enough at this time to say that the arguments which Senator Patterson presents are, from beginning to end, a reproduction of the arguments that have been made for a hundred years in behalf of every industry for which protection has been asked. For a century each industry that asks for the privilege of taxing the rest of the people, has been accustomed to marshal figures to show that a failure to comply with its demand would mean the sure destruction of the industry and ultimate suffering to the country.

Mr. Patterson's argument follows the protectionist line even to the final warning that the reduction may only be temporary, and that "if" favored industry is destroyed, the consumer will become the victim of higher prices. He says:

"That putting sugar on the free list will make sugar cheaper in the end, is justly open to challenge; for should free sugar destroy or seriously cripple the American sugar industry, the last condition of the consumer may be worse than the first."

And then he adds:

"But I make no issue on this point---only the future can determine it."

This saving clause does not save. If it is not intended as an argument, it ought not to be advanced. It is merely a speculation, and indicates the extent to which Mr. Patterson has allowed his advocacy of this particular industry to lead him into the language employed by the protectionist.

The purpose of this editorial, however, is to combat the conclusion which he presses upon the senators from Colorado. Mr. Patterson says:

"Our senators should, it seems to me, stand side by side with the two democratic senators from Louisiana. They should insist that the sugar schedule be taken up and disposed of by itself."

He then proceeds to say that the tariff is being revised "in a lump," "to intimidate the

weak." This is an unfair impeachment of the purposes of the party and of the motives of the president. He concludes:

"United States senators are now elected by the people. They must even be nominated in an open primary. Patronage and White House favor will not take the place of services patriotically and faithfully performed."

This is an injustice to Senators Thomas and Shaffroth. He does a wrong to the senators in suggesting that their support of the bill will be due to "patronage and White House favor." It is, in effect, an attempt to impose a different course of action upon them under the threat that they will not be considered as patriotic or faithful in the performance of their duties as senators unless they take Mr. Patterson's view of the subject.

The Commoner is sure that its distinguished and beloved friend does not mean to set himself up as a final judge in this matter, or to demand acquiescence in his opinion as the price of his confidence and good will.

Senators Thomas and Shaffroth were elected as democrats and they will be justified in considering themselves as democrats, not merely as representatives of a particular industry. Comparatively few of the voters of Colorado are personally interested in the production of sugar. Why should the senators from Colorado consider the wishes of sugar producers only? Have not those who pay the tax as much right to be regarded as those who receive the benefit of the tax?

And does not Mr. Patterson know that Senators Thomas and Shaffroth must act WITH the tariff reformers or against the tariff reformers? The Louisiana senators may be willing to join with the republicans and defeat a tariff law and thus deny to the people of the country the reform for which they have labored for so many years, but will the senators from Colorado be performing a "patriotic and faithful" service if they cast in their lot with those who make everything subordinate to sugar?

If Mr. Patterson desires to consider the effect of the votes on their political future, why not remember that Congressman Keating of Colorado was elected to the house of representatives after boldly taking his stand in favor of free sugar? Would this not be some indication of the temper of the people of Colorado?

Can Mr. Patterson give bond that the voters of his state will applaud its senators if they become responsible for the defeat of tariff reduction? Would it not be well also for him to recall the fate of the democratic senators who in the past have put the interests of special industries above the demand of the nation?

The Commoner commends the spirit in which Colorado's senators have addressed themselves to the work of fulfilling the pledges of the party, and is glad to believe that they will consult their democratic colleagues who are striving to assist the president in the carrying out of his high purpose rather than senators who are willing to jeopardize the party's fate merely because they believe that some industry in which they are specially interested may suffer injustice. The injustice which the tariff has wrought for so many years still exists and that injustice will continue until the rates are materially lowered. The senators from the sugar-producing states can not afford to make all tariff reform dependent on what they regard as fair rates to a single industry.

EFFICIENCY

The bureau of foreign and domestic commerce has made a report that a comparison of seventeen industries in Great Britain and the United States shows that the manufacturing establishments in this country have higher efficiency, and that two and a half times as many wage-earners and one-sixth more power are needed in the United Kingdom than in the United States to produce a net output of equal value.

Plainly the people of the United States have nothing to fear in the department of commercial effort.

SIMPLE JUSTICE

The Sacramento Bee, referring to the attitude of the United States with respect to the controversy between the syndicates and South American republics, says:

"What the United States should seek to do in such matters is simple justice. It should not aid any American corporation to rob a friendly government."

That is just the attitude of the United States under the Wilson administration.

"ONLY IN ALCOHOL"

Speaking of the wineless dinner, the Montreal Star says: "The peace of the world that can be preserved only in alcohol may not, after all, be the peace of the world for which we are all looking."