

The Commoner. ISSUED WEEKLY.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN Editor and Proprietor. CHARLES W. BRYAN Publisher. RICHARD L. METCALFE Associate Editor. Editorial Rooms and Business Office 224-250 South 12th Street

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

Table with subscription rates: One Year \$1.00, Three Months .35, Six Months .50, Single Copy .10, Clubs of Five or more Sample Copies Free, Per Year .75, Foreign Postage 12 Cents Extra

SUBSCRIPTIONS can be sent direct to The Commoner. They can also be sent through newspapers which have a reduced 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.

the use of tobacco was so general that it might truthfully be listed as one of the necessities of life. In 1898, when the government was sorely in need of revenue, it increased the tariff tax on tobacco. Deluded by the belief that the consumer was a substantiality instead of a myth, in the same act in which it assessed the tobacco manufacturers a greater internal revenue tax, it also granted these manufacturers the right to reduce the size of the packages they had theretofore been selling at a stipulated price. In a few years, with the war at an end, the tax was put back at the old figure, but, by some chance oversight, of course, congress neglected to repeal that section relating to the size of packages. Ever since 1902 the tobacco trust has been selling the small sized package and paying the original revenue tax.

In a speech the other day Senator Beveridge computed that by this legislation the government had handed over to the tobacco trust in the last eight years the right to collect a tax of \$180,000,000 from the users of tobacco. Would not Senator Lodge have a difficult time of it convincing the men who have paid this tax that they do not exist? C. Q. D.

"TAFT'S SERVICE TO ALDRICH"

Immediately after the republican national convention of 1908 Senator LaFollette sent to Mr. Taft the following telegram:

"Madison, Wisconsin, June 18. William H. Taft, Washington, D. C.—While the platform is disappointing in some fundamental provisions and omissions, and I shall claim the right to say so, I congratulate you most sincerely and, IN THE FAITH THAT YOU ARE MORE NEARLY IN ACCORD WITH THE GREAT BODY OF REPUBLICAN VOTERS THAN THE PLATFORM, I shall do all in my power to insure your election.

"ROBERT M. LAFOLLETTE." AFTER THE ELECTION

Just to what extent Senator LaFollette's faith was justified may be shown by an editorial appearing in Senator LaFollette's paper and entitled, "Taft's Service to Aldrich." In this article Editor LaFollette says:

"President Taft has from the beginning of his administration enjoyed the good will of the nation. The people generally, the press, and congress have been disposed to credit him with high motives and unwilling to criticise any public act unfairly.

"LaFollette's shares this feeling that has prevailed for Mr. Taft, and no one would be more reluctant to believe otherwise. But it would be a betrayal of the work we have undertaken if we did not say from our point of view the

president's recent message to congress was inopportune and not in the public interest."

It is recalled that at the opening of the special session, it was expected President Taft would send in a message telling what kind of a tariff bill he wanted, the article says, and continues:

"No greater opportunity for executive recommendation ever could come to a president. An expression of his views at that time respecting an income tax or a corporation tax would have carried great weight with congress and with the public. That he didn't send such a message can only be explained on the ground that he believed congress well understood his attitude and that there was no danger of the president framing a law he could not approve, either as to tariff schedules or as to an income tax."

Then, reciting the history of the tariff bill and telling how Aldrich has revised the tariff upwards it is pointed out that Mr. Taft might have given great help to progressives, who were fighting for downward revision and that the progressives failed to get downward revision, but that under the leadership of Senators Cummins and Bailey an alliance was formed that insured the passage of an income tax. Then, it is said, Mr. Aldrich made a hurry call on the president to defeat the income tax by the use of the corporation tax. Senator LaFollette criticises President Taft for not giving Senators Cummins, Borah and other progressive senators a hearing before writing his message.

The president's changed views on the income tax are then referred to in the article, which concludes as follows:

"The president assumed that the corporation tax is unconstitutional, but with due regard for his learning and experience, it must be admitted that he might serve to change his views on this question also. It certainly appears to raise some complex legal questions, that can only be settled by the decision of the supreme court. One fact stands out high and plain above all else in the situation. This message came to congress at a most opportune time to serve the fixed determination of Senator Aldrich to defeat the income tax and to aid him in passing the tariff bill with its excessively high duties just as he wanted it.

"The president holds out the inducement that the information as to business and business methods incidentally gained in the collection of a corporation tax would be useful in government supervision of corporations. Whatever the president may expect in this direction we may be sure that such a purpose is no part of Mr. Aldrich's plan. Knowledge of the income of over-capitalized public service corporations and of many private corporations is an important factor in their control. But this question of the control of trusts and combinations is by far the most important problem before the country for this quarter century, relatively much more important than the tariff. This great question can not be treated hurriedly as a second thought to a tariff measure. All who have had experience in a struggle for control of railway corporations understand that. To place dependence for basic information on a hurriedly prepared amendment to a tariff bill, rushed through an extra session of congress, which may be years going through the courts and finally declared unconstitutional, is a clever, but not unknown, expedient to avert all effective legislation on a subject that will not down."

A QUESTION OF EVIDENCE

Senator Aldrich says the prices of agricultural implements are lower in this country than abroad. He promised that he would submit absolute proof from the department of commerce and labor that the International Harvester company did not charge higher prices for their implements in this country than abroad.

We will admit that Senator Aldrich can prove anything he wishes by the department of commerce and labor—that is if we are confiding enough to accept the statements of that department as proof. But while Senator Aldrich is getting his witnesses together we will offer a few of our own. The first one we will call to the stand is Nelson W. Aldrich who in a speech in the senate, delivered June 2, 1906, said:

"It is a well known fact about which there is no dispute that producers in the United States and in every one of the great industrial nations sell portions of their products from time to time at a less price to people of other countries than to their regular customers at home."

When Charles M. Schwab of the Carnegie Steel company, afterwards president of the steel trust, testified before the industrial commis-

sion in 1901 the record shows the following:

Q. Is it a fact generally proved of all exporters in this country that they do sell at lower prices in foreign markets than they do in the homemarkets? A. That is true, perfectly true.

Q. Would you say that when business is in a normal condition the export prices are regularly somewhat lower than home prices? A. Oh, yes, always.

Next let's hear from Hon. Jeremiah Rusk, President Harrison's secretary of agriculture. He makes the assertion that Senator Aldrich says he can prove to be untrue. He said:

"I had an opportunity to take some stock in the combination (American Harvester company) and I know what inducements were offered. An investigation will show that this same combination is now selling or offering to sell, machinery in Russia and Australia and other wheat-growing countries at a lower figure than they do in this country."

It would be easy to produce more witnesses, but these—all republicans and protectionists—should suffice.

Agricultural implements are manufactured cheaper in this country than in any other and are exported all over the world. Not a dollar's worth of them has been imported in twelve years.—Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union.

FORGOTTEN TROUBLE

Do you know what it was that caused you to fret,

Only a year ago?

Can you tell me the source of your utmost regret,

Only a year ago?

It looked big to you then and you moped and you pined,

The long nights were sleepless and troubled your mind,

Yet you can't tell what happened, in looking behind,

Only a year ago?

Do you know why you frowned as you journeyed your way,

Only a month ago?

Can you tell now what made all your blue skies look gray,

Only a month ago?

What trouble was it that your happiness marred, That caused you to say that your heart had grown hard,

And from all future joys in this world you were barred,

Only a month ago?

You've forgotten them all, both the great and the small,

The pain and the woe;

For few are the troubles we ever recall

As onward we go.

Ah, few are the troubles, my brother, that last. They seem big at first, but the moment's they're past,

They slip from the mind, for they never stick fast.

It is well that it's so.

—Detroit Free Press.

A REPUBLICAN SENATOR'S OPINION

OF A REPUBLICAN ATTORNEY

GENERAL

The following Associated Press dis-

patch explains itself:

Washington, July 1.—During his

speech in the senate this afternoon on

the income tax, Senator Borah of Idaho

declared that the facts regarding "the

great and shocking crime of the sugar

trust, which branded many government

officials and employes as criminal or in-

competent, had lain in the attorney gen-

eral's office for months," and that no

action was taken until private individ-

uals uncovered the crime and moved the

public.

"When I saw," he said, "that the only

answer given when they were asked why

they did not prosecute was that quizzical,

cynical, inscrutable, insufferable

smile that so often plays over the imper-

ialistic features of the attorney general

—when I see these things I am amazed,

not that the people are socialistic or rest-

less, but that they continue to have an

abiding faith and abiding belief in this

great government under which we live."
