

# COMMENT ON TIMELY TOPICS

President Taft's explanation of the Controller Bay matter explains altogether too much. The explanation reminds us of the old parrot story. Remember it? A parrot was much given to swearing. Its owner, seeking to break it of the habit, soused the bird in water after it had indulged in a profane spell. As it preened its bedraggled feathers the bird sagely remarked: "I know what's the matter with me; I talked too d—d much!" We commend the story to the prayerful consideration of William Howard Taft.

If Dr. Wiley "goes," then will also go the people's only protection against conscienceless money grabbers who are willing to poison people by wholesale for the sake of making a profit. Scratch a man who is demanding the scalp of Dr. Wiley and you will uncover a man who has been thwarted in his efforts to feed adulterants to the public.

The very best feature of reciprocity is not that it will afford an interchange with Canada. That is a mere incident. We are not importers of hay and grain, but exporters. But the tariff beneficiaries have been holding on to their graft by making the farmers believe that farmers are hugely benefitted by a tariff on agricultural products. Reciprocity is going to show the farmers the fallacy of that claim, and when it is thus shown the farmers are going to arise as one man and demand that the tariff on manufactured goods be reduced very materially. And that is where the real benefit of Canadian reciprocity will come in. As a matter of fact, easily demonstrated, the tariff on agricultural implements costs the average farmer more in one year than he has been benefitted in his whole life by the tariff on agricultural products.

The "American Economist," organ of the tariff beneficiaries and subsidized by them, is woefully depressed and cast down because of the passage of what it is pleased to call the "free trade reciprocity bill." With tears as big as walnuts streaming from its eyes the "American Economist" sobs out this query: "What benefit are free trade schedules and lower prices to men and women out of money and out of work?" Well, speaking as a mechanic who has seen the time, more than once, when he was out of money and out of work, the editor of this newspaper hastens to answer: The benefits of a free trade schedule and lower prices to men and women out of money and out of work, are vastly more than the benefits of outrageous 'protective' schedules and exorbitant prices to men and women out of

money and out of work. We are a victim, not a beneficiary, of the system that the "American Economist" is subsidized by tariff barons to support.

Senator Bailey was run over by the steam roller when he opposed the passage of the reciprocity bill. We are astonished to learn that Bailey did not arise in his outraged wrath and send in another resignation. Also bitterly disappointed.

Prohibition was defeated in Texas by less than 5,000 majority. This means that a majority of Texans favor prohibition, for we well know that the anti-prohibition forces got out a full vote, while the prohibition forces suffered from the usual ennui that falls upon the opponents of any public menace. Reformers are very prone to do all of their thundering in the index, leaving those who favor the existing order of things to get out the vote. But it is just as well for Texas that prohibition was defeated. Not until the overwhelming sentiment of a state is favorable to prohibition can that policy be made even partly effective. When the sentiment is almost equal prohibition is worse than a farce—and it usually is a farce anyhow. It is going to take vastly more than a legislative enactment and a search and seizure writ to effect the moral regeneration of mankind.

One of the best features of Mike Harrington's speech as chairman of the democratic state convention was that part urging Nebraskans to guard the power sites on their rivers. Some of these days the Loups, the Niobrara, the Platte and the Blues are going to furnish the power to turn a million factory wheels in this state. The time is coming when Nebraskans will see the folly of sending their raw material to Massachusetts to be worked up, and then buying it back, paying freight both ways and draining Nebraska of money that should be going into the pockets of Nebraska workers.

Of course, and to be sure! The Stanley steel trust investigating committee has discovered a working alliance between the steel trust and various other trusts manufacturing articles into which steel largely enters. For instance, the steel trust rebates \$3 a ton to the harvester trust. Harold McCormick is the high mogul of the harvester trust. Harold is the son-in-law of John D. Rockefeller. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., is the son-in-law of ex-Senator Nelson W. Aldrich, framer of the present tariff law—"the best ever" in the expressed opinion of President Taft. The harvester trust uses that rebate to

benefit the foreign consumer. The domestic consumer gets nothing but the gaff. The harvester trust delivers its wares on the dock at New York, ready for export, at the same price it demands of the domestic consumer f. o. b. at Chicago. This gives the foreigner from \$6 to \$10 per machine the best of it.

Ex-Senator Billy Mason says the boodle fund is ever present in Illinois politics. No one knows it better than Billy Mason. It was boodle that defeated him for re-election; it was boodle that beat him out of a re-nomination two years ago; it was boodle that elected Lorimer. There is only one Illinois organization more rotten than Illinois democracy, and that is Illinois republicanism. Illinois republicanism is the rottenest because there is more of it than there is of Illinois democracy.

Don't get excited. Even if President Taft does not veto the new wool tariff bill—which he is quite likely to have done ere this issue of Will Maupin's Weekly goes to press—it will not mean any particular saving to you in clothing purchases this year, or ever. Even with the wool tariff cut in two squarely in the middle, there will be enough "protection" left to enable the woolen trust to retain its cinch.

Did you ever stop to think that perhaps one reason for the high cost of living is the multiplicity of small profits between the producer and the consumer, rather than to a big profit for one or two? Take wool, for instance. The sheep raiser makes his clip and sells it to a commission man. The commission man sells it to a big wool firm, taking his profit. The wool firm sells it to another commission man, taking its profit. This commission man sells it to a woolen mill, taking his profit. The mill weaves the wool and sells it to a commission man, taking its profit. Between the producer of the raw a broker, taking his profit. The broker sells to a clothing manufacturer, taking his profit. The manufacturer makes up the cloth and sells it to a broker in clothing, taking his profit. The broker sells to the retailer, taking his profit. Lastly the retailer sells to the consumer, taking his profit. Between the producer of the raw wool and the purchaser of the woolen clothing a score or more middlemen get their slice. Yet we wonder that we are today paying \$20 or \$25 for a suit of "all wool" clothes that ten or fifteen years ago we could purchase for \$12 or \$15. Our business machinery is too blamed cumbersome and complex. There should be a