

best and most economical means of supply, it is not only foolish but useless to seek to destroy them. The trusts have come to stay. Instead of wasting time and energy in fighting them it is clearly the sensible plan to welcome them, and guide them into safe and beneficent paths. Legislation can and should be devised to extract the fangs of the beef trust and other cruel monopolies that oppress the poor by increasing the cost of living. But the beneficent trusts—and nearly all of them can be made so—should be encouraged and fostered by wise and progressive laws.—Kansas City Journal (rep.)

RAISING THE COST OF LIVING

Burdens Which the Payne Tariff Bill Will Impose Upon the People and Benefits to Special Interests

The Payne bill is distinguished from all other tariff bills in the last thirty years by a duty on importation of tea. This is a wise provision. Every penny, less the cost of collection, upon importations of tea will reach the United States treasury. The greater part of the other duties proposed are simply in the nature of a surrender of taxation in favor of special private interests which our government clothes with power to levy tribute on the great body of consumers. To illustrate: We will import under the Payne bill probably about \$500,000,000 worth of highly protected products which will pay an average ad valorem rate of duty of at least 40 per cent, while the domestic producer, by reason of the prohibitive or restrictive duties of that bill, through the agency of the trusts, will raise to the duty line the selling price of more than \$10,000,000,000 worth of like domestic products to the consumers of this country.

In short, the bill, when enacted, will not only impose high duties upon \$500,000,000 of imports, but in practical effect will permit a few thousand manufacturers to make 90,000,000 consumers pay them tribute of \$4,000,000,000 in the enhanced price of their goods.

France exempted its nobles in the eighteenth century from taxation, while the peasants and the middle classes defrayed the expenses of government. We go further and delegate to a few thousand men the exclusive privilege of practically taxing for their own benefit the whole body of our consumers.

This proposed bill of Mr. Payne's will not curb the plunder of a single trust. It will not add a dollar to the public revenue, and revenue we must have. We have a deficit in the payment of ordinary current expenses of the government of about \$90,000,000. The appropriations for the fiscal year 1910 are \$1,044,000,000. It is evident that Mr. Payne and his associates appreciated the danger that this bill would not produce sufficient revenue for the expenses of the government, because they provided for the sale of \$40,000,000 of Panama bonds and authorized the issue of \$250,000,000 of treasury certificates. Our tariff makers have simply provided for forced loans to defray the current disbursements of the government rather than to lessen the burdens of consumers by reducing prohibitive duties and thereby making the bill produce a sufficient revenue.

The cruel wool and woolen schedules remain unchanged except as to a slight reduction in carpet wools, while the duties on carpets of every description continue, and average from 136 per cent to 156 per cent upon the cheaper grades of carpets used in flats or apartments by the poorer people. William Whitman will still enjoy six cents per pound duty on "tops" notwithstanding the cost of changing 100 pounds of wool to "tops" through "combing" is not five cents. Not only have the woolen men been secured in the continuance of high duties on woolens, but the glass manufacturers are to enjoy even increased profits on a considerable part of their product. The duty on the smallest size of plate glass has been increased from an equivalent of 82 per cent to 103.04 per cent. The second in size has been increased from 63 per cent to 73.3 per cent, while window glass, now made in this country more cheaply than anywhere else in the world by the use of recently patented machinery controlled by a single corporation, remains still protected by duties of from 80 per cent to 200 per cent.

In the schedule devoted to cotton goods and yarns no material decrease in duties exists, but there has been an increase of duty on mercerized fabrics and an increase of duty on hosiery so great as to amount to almost a prohibition of imports. While a reduction of the duty on leather has been proposed, still the duty on women's and children's leather gloves of certain

sizes has been increased from 30 per cent to 300 per cent over the rates existing in the Dingley bill.

There is, however, no agitator in the world so powerful as injustice, and ere long the great body of consumers will appreciate their helplessness, and then they will unite and put an end to these oppressive duties.—Franklin Pierce in the New York World.

IS THE "G. O. P.'S" DOOM DAY AT HAND?

Genoa, Ohio, March 15.—Editor The Commoner: Enclosed you will find a clipping from a local weekly paper. The editor of this paper is an old republican, eighty-four years old and I think it quite interesting to note the view he now takes of the republican party. He seems always to have been one of those standpat fellows, but he now seems to think that the republican party is about to close its career.

G. E. NEIHOUSEMYER.

DOOM DAY

The fate of the republican party seems to be sealed. President Taft has called a special session of congress to meet Monday next, to revise the tariff; which means that it will be placed on a comparatively free trade basis. This is to be done "to increase the revenue," that the government may have the money to continue its extravagance as demonstrated during the past ten or fifteen years. It is a little singular that our lawmakers never think of economizing—never think of dispensing with a horde of useless officeholders and cutting down the extravagant salaries of those necessary to transact the business of the country.

One-half the duties on lumber and the manufacture of lumber are to be cut off. Hides are to be placed on the free list. The duties on wool are to be greatly reduced, as well as the duties on all imported goods of every description. A duty is to be put on coffee, and that on tea increased. Won't that be nice? There also is talk of a revival of the war taxes on telegrams, bank checks, and so on infinitum. There is also talk of imposing an inheritance tax and of reviving the stamp tax!

All of which forebodes dire disaster to the republican party and to the country. If such statesmanship (?) is carried out, the republican party has elected its last president. It has been a grand old party, but it looks as if its "doom day" will soon be here. Well, we were in at its inception and it may be fitting that we should witness its exit.

A STUPENDOUS HOLDUP

Olof Larsen, a hardware dealer of Lyndon, Kansas, makes the following interesting contribution to tariff literature:

In the March 12th issue of The Commoner, Mr. Harry Boorman of Washington makes a few remarks concerning the tariff rebbery that the American people have endured a long time and are now called upon to endure in a more aggravated form than ever for at least four years more under the monopolistic trust worshipping administration of Mr. Taft and his cabinet, made up without a single exception of old cunning, skilled and unprincipled corporation attorneys whose life has been spent in defeating the administration of our laws, justice and keeping our rich malefactors out of the penitentiary where they in all justice and decency belong, by virtue of such men's works and the assistance of the corrupt machine ridden republican party and laws and courts are now become the laughing stock of the civilized world.

I very much doubt if Mr. Boorman or the majority of The Commoner's readers realize the magnitude of this stupendous hold up that we are forced to stand for. The writer has spent several years in the employ of the International Harvester trust, the last four years of which I spent having charge of a large territory for them in northern Europe, quitting their employ about seventeen months ago, am now engaged in the hardware and implement business here. During my trips to Europe I sold to European dealers harvesting machinery F. O. B. cars at Chicago as follows: Binders \$33, mowers \$12, hay rakes \$5, and reapers for \$15 less than they are sold to American dealers, besides selling the European trade a special, stronger made and more durable machine than domestic types, in order to handle the heavy crops raised over there and compete with the substantially built European machines. Here the trust is free from any such competition as our tariff imposes a prohibitive duty on machinery, namely \$85 on a self binder. All other American manufactured articles are

sold abroad at about the same ratio, for instance, a certain Waltham watch movement which costs here \$18.50 is sold all over Europe for \$12, and I might go on and mention hundreds of articles. The fact is we can manufacture goods cheaper here in the United States than they can in Europe in a great many instances. Therefore there is no need of any tariff, only for the purpose of robbing our own people for the benefit of a few "undesirable" citizens.

In Denmark, Norway and Sweden, where I worked, the railroads are owned and operated by the government and although it costs more to operate the roads there than here the nominal first class passenger fare is only seven-eighths of one cent per English mile, and freight and express rates in the same proportion; nevertheless the roads are making a yearly dividend, a portion of which is divided among the employees annually, who are also pensioned for life after serving the government in this capacity for a certain term of years. Nice comparison, this, here in our boasted advanced civilization—the government in the hands of the republican party serves the office of the highwayman holding up the people while the trust robbers go through our pockets.

OLOF LARSEN.

STRAWS—BY A WOMAN

Chautauqua, N. Y., April 8, 1909.—Editor The Commoner: I enclose some political "straws." Sometime you may care to use them.

Before the late election democrats and many republicans expressed unreservedly their belief that if Taft was elected the twenty-nine million dollar fine of the Standard Oil company would never be collected or cut in half. A staunch republican recently said to me: "Even Mr. Bryan's bitterest enemy never imagined the case would end as it has recently done. The lane may be long. I think I can foresee the turning."

Last week I asked a "doubly dyed" and most zealous republican the following questions. I am sending you the result:

If the democratic party had been in power for twelve years would not you and all your newspapers be crying out over the "damning extravagance" of the democrats because of the present large deficit in the public fund?

If a democratic president had been elected and you knew it took more than a million dollars to elect him, and five million more to inaugurate him, would not you have been indignant and soundly denounced the party for their wanton extravagance?

If Mr. Bryan had been elected and had asked for and received an annual appropriation of \$12,000 for automobiles and their care, would not you have "fussed" long and loud?

If a democratic president had been elected and had promptly made up his cabinet from corporation lawyers—giving the bureau of corporations into the hands of a Standard Oil lawyer would you not have said—to express it mildly—the people are not considered—plutocracy controls our national government?

If a democratic president had been elected and immediately the business men in many industries had reduced the wages of labor and closed many plants would you not have laid the whole blame of business depression and the ills of the unemployed on the party in power?

If a democratic president had been elected and in a public address, following that election, had said * * * would you not have said that the thought behind the expression was treason to the federal constitution and that personal liberty was far from safe?

Now I can not at present recall the exact wording of that last question and have "passed on" my papers containing it to neighbors and voters, but it was a plain statement of what the legislative, executive and judicial folk must do. By legislative action, executive decree, and judicial interpretation the constitution must be manipulated to fit present conditions. Am sure you have the exact wording.

Bishop Warren Candler of Atlanta makes a fine reply to this same. My Atlanta Journal is also "passed on."

Well, I asked of my good republican friend a reply to these questions. The gentleman frankly replied: "A vigorous and a most emphatic, not to add an indignant, yes, to each and all your very pertinent questions."

It is a bundle of "straws." If they are of any use to "our party" and the cause of right you can use them. Not over my name, however, for they would lose their force. They are a woman's questions, and being so would be "pooh-poohed" by many of your readers.