

The Commoner.

ISSUED WEEKLY.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN Editor and Proprietor.
 RICHARD L. METCALFE Associate Editor.

CHARLES W. BRYAN Publisher.
 Editorial Rooms and Business Office 124-520 South 12th Street

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

One Year - - - - \$1.00
 Six Months - - - - .50
 Three Months - - - - .25
 Single Copy - - - - .05

11 Clubs of Five or more.
 Per Year - - - - .75

Foreign Postage 62 Cents 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 31, 08, means that payment has been received to and including the last issue of January, 1908. 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 furnished upon application.

Address all communications to

THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Neb.

cause they were starting. In another family of nine living on an income of \$1,500 which was most intelligently spent, only \$33 was eked out for furniture. In another of two on \$689, \$11.93.

It is obvious very little can be bought at best, but in many cases that little is much less than it would have been ten years ago. A table which in 1896 could have been bought at wholesale for \$13.80 cost \$16.50 in 1906. Common maple chairs increased from \$6 to \$8.91 a dozen at wholesale. Ash bed room sets from \$8.75 to \$12.95. All kinds of woodenware was much dearer. But what can be expected? They have gone up with the materials from which they are made. Free lumber brought all of these articles down under the Wilson bill. The restoration of the duty by the Dingley bill sent them up, and yet those who plead for duties always assure us that we will get our goods cheaper under the tariff. That was Mr. McKinley's plea and promise when he put through the duty on tin plate. But how has it worked for the consumer through the eighteen years since we gave it to him? The McKinley bill put the tariff on tin plate at 2 1/5 cents per pound. The immediate effect was to raise the price of tin plate from 15 to 20 per cent. Every housewife remembers how tin dishes of all sorts went up after the McKinley bill was passed. Indeed if we could analyze causes down to the bottom no small influence in electing Mr. Cleveland in 1892 would be found to be due to the higher price which every farmer's wife paid the traveling peddler for pie plates and dippers.

The Standard Oil company has been, for many years, probably the largest single consumer of tin plate in the country—practically all of the oil it sends to the Orient being put into tin cans which it manufactures itself from imported plate. Now one of the many curious features of our tariff laws is the system of drawbacks by which the duty on imported materials made into goods for export is rebated. These rebates or drawbacks are paid on many things but the amount is insignificant excepting in two or three cases. Out of drawbacks aggregating something like five and a quarter millions in 1900 and five and three-quarters in 1906 by far the largest item was tin plate—\$1,848,792 in the former year, \$2,252,381.82 in the latter. That is, the man who in 1906 manufactured tin cans to sell to his countrymen paid about 20 per cent more for his material than the Standard Oil company paid for what it manufactured to sell to the foreigner. Of course the home consumer of tin pails and milk pans paid the higher cost. But why we should be taxed to build up a tin

plate industry at home, and the Standard Oil company be free from the tax does not seem quite clear.

What It Costs a People to Create an Industry

To be sure as a result of taxing ourselves we have a tin plate industry in the United States. In 1900 as a result of the high prices of the decade preceding fifty-seven tin plate establishments had grown up where ten years before there were none. These fifty-seven establishments employed about 4,000 people and turned out near \$32,000,000 worth of goods. In 1905 the industry had grown to a product of something over \$35,000,000 and employed about 5,000 people. In order to build up this industry, secure this product, provide places for these workmen, it has been estimated that we taxed ourselves between 1890 and 1900 fully \$90,000,000. Taxed ourselves \$90,000,000 and let off our largest single consumer scot free. We also have been selling abroad the tin plate we manufacture here at considerably less price than at home. And now observe how in the case of tin plate the protected American manufacturer gets even on this lower price to the foreigner. He takes it out of the laborer—that is, the wages of tin plate workers are reduced 25 per cent on tin plate made for export. The Standard Oil trust gets its duties rebated on export work and the tin plate workers get their wages cut!

Bargains for Foreigners

One of the most exasperating features of the tariff as it is now working out—one most unjust to the poor—is that while we are paying these high prices at home our protected manufacturers are supplying Englishmen and Frenchmen and Chinamen with the same articles at prices from 10 to 70 per cent lower! Indeed the Dingley bill had not been long in operation before the administration itself warned the iron and steel people officially that they were in danger of giving the game away if they continued to sell steel rails, for months together, to foreigners for \$22 a ton, while they charged their compatriots \$35. But the warning seems to have had little effect. Frank manufacturers like Mr. Schwab have said, of course we sell cheaper to foreigners. We must—not only that but we sell materials to our fellow manufacturers cheaper when they are to be turned into goods for foreigners than we do when they are to be turned into goods for our own people!

So sweeping is this practice that the tariff reform committee declared after an investigation of the export trade for the year ending in June, 1900, that of \$452,000,000 exports of that year 85 to 90 per cent were sold on an average of 20 per cent lower than at home. It sometimes seems as if the great American system for making the foreigner pay the duty had resulted in presenting it to the foreigner. He buys our goods cheaper than we can buy them, and like Mr. Coates he establishes his factory here and protected from world competition drives our own manufacturers into his combination, runs the business from the other side of the waters and charges us twice as much as he can his countrymen!

Admitting if you will that it was just to make the people of this country, on \$2 a day and less, pay the major share of the cost of the civil war, the cost of reconstruction, the cost of establishing all sorts of industries and protecting them through long terms of years from the competition of the world, has the time not come when the committee on ways and means can be asked to consider without sneering, at least, the burden which the protective tariff places today on millions of American families—tens of thousands of lonely working women living on incomes where every penny counts?

HOW THE TARIFF AFFECTS YOU

Many persons regard tariff discussions as dry reading, but the same persons so regard them because of failure to understand their personal bearing upon their own welfare. Here are a few items from the Payne bill that show exactly how intimately the proposed tariff duties will affect the individual family:

Borax, 2 cents per pound; gelatine, 20 per cent ad valorem; varnish, 25 per cent ad valorem; soap, 1 cent per pound; sponges, 30 per cent ad valorem; chinaware, 60 per cent ad valorem; glassware, 60 per cent ad valorem; hooks and eyes, 4 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem; pins, 35 per cent ad valorem; toothpicks, 2 cents per thousand and 15 per cent ad valorem; sugar, 1.91 cents per pound; mo-

lasses, 6 cents per gallon; maple sugar and maple syrup, 4 cents per pound; candy, 4 cents a pound and 15 per cent ad valorem; cigars and cigarettes, \$4.50 per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem; barley, 15 cents a bushel; buckwheat, 15 cents a bushel; corn, 15 cents a bushel; cornmeal, 40 cents a hundred pounds; macaroni, 1 1/2 cents a pound; oats, 15 cents a bushel; oatmeal, 1 cent a pound; rice, 2 cents a pound; rye, 10 cents a bushel; wheat, 25 cents a bushel; flour, 25 per cent ad valorem; biscuits, bread and wafers, 25 per cent ad valorem; butter, 6 cents a pound; cheese, 6 cents a pound; milk, 2 cents a gallon; cream, 5 cents a gallon; beans, 45 cents a bushel; beets, 25 per cent ad valorem; tinned beans, ease, mushrooms, etc., 2 1/2 cents a pound; preserved vegetables, 40 per cent ad valorem; pickles, 40 per cent ad valorem; cabbages, 2 cents each; cider, 5 cents a gallon; eggs, 5 cents per dozen; hay, \$4 per ton; honey, 20 cents per gallon; onions, 40 cents per bushel; green peas, 40 cents per bushel; dried peas, 45 cents per bushel; potatoes, 25 cents per bushel; fish, 1/4 to 1 cent per pound; apples, 25 cents per bushel; figs, 2 1/2 cents per pound; lemons, 1 1/4 cents per pound; pineapples, \$8 per thousand; peanuts, 1 cent a pound; bacon and ham, 4 cents a pound; fresh beef, 1 1/2 cents a pound; lard 1 1/2 cents a pound; poultry, live, 3 cents a pound; dead, 5 cents a pound; cocoa, 5 1/2 cents a pound; salt, 12 cents a hundred pounds; starch, 1 cent a pound; spices, 3 cents a pound; vinegar, 7 1/2 cents a gallon.

The tax on tea and the countervailing duty on coffee, which appeared in the original bill, have been struck out by the committee on ways and means.

Always the justification for the fixing of tariff duties that increase the cost of living is that "labor is protected." Congressman Sulzer of New York, who recently denied that labor is protected by the tariff, finds confirmation of his statement from this data, secured in the United States census:

Class 1—United States citizens not subjected to foreign competition, therefore unprotected—	
Farmers, planters, farm hands, doctors, lawyers, servants, etc.....	21,800,000
Masons, miners, railway employes, shoemakers, bakers, etc.....	4,300,000
Class 2—United States citizens not subjected to foreign competition if raw materials are admitted free, therefore unprotected—	
Machinists, mill hands, tailors, dress-makers and various workers.....	2,395,000
Class 3—United States citizens subjected to foreign competition, therefore protected.....	600,000

Making 2 per cent of American workers who are benefited by protection.

President Taft has personally protested recently that the duties on necessities of living are not reduced enough for the welfare of the wage-winners of the country, which is manifest in the details of the bill itself as partially presented in the above epitomatization. It maintains, furthermore, the barbarous duties on woolen clothing and would increase the exorbitant rates on hosiery and gloves.

The tariff-mongers are furthermore confronted with the fact that wages are lower in the protected industries than in the industries that know nothing of the tariff but its exactions, and where wages are maintained by the power of labor unions. Where are lower wages paid than in the sugar refineries and the woolen mills? Have the workers in the pulp mills and the hosiery factories reason to sing the praises of the high tariff?

While wages in this country are nominally higher than in most lands, the labor is more strenuous and more productive. At the same time the cost of living is much higher.

Conceding that the opportunities of workers are greater in this favored land than elsewhere, the absurdity is in attributing this to the wonder-working power of the tariff. In the most highly protected industries there is a movement toward a reduction of wages.

How does this consist with all the talk that the high tariff makes high wages?

Whenever did a reduction in the cost of living follow a reduction in wages?

The new tariff measure would actually increase the cost of living.—Oklahoma City Oklahoman.

Revision downward? Sure! Twenty per cent decrease in the tariff on luxuries; ten per cent increase in the tariff on the necessities of life. What's the average "reduction?"