

# MR. BAILEY'S SPEECHES

vidually the party can not rely with confidence on the fulfillment of its platforms—a conclusion that has been forced on the whole country by the spectacle of betrayal witnessed in the recent session of congress.

Until recently, Mr. Bryan has not attached the relative importance to the tariff that it has deserved. If he will stick to the tariff as the paramount issue of the next congressional election and the succeeding presidential election, either ignoring or giving minor place to other national questions, and avoiding altogether such new, eccentric or doubtful issues as he has proposed in the past, and which have lost him votes and prestige, he will go far, through his potential leadership, toward bringing the democratic party around to a sound, stable basis of action.

The tariff is by far the biggest political issue before the country. Barring the accidents of time, it will remain the biggest issue until it is settled, and settled right. To comprehend this fact and to act with wisdom and patriotism in accordance therewith is public service of as high a quality as any leader of men can attain to in American politics.—Kansas City Star.

ALDRICH CROWNED AS REPUBLICAN LEADER  
"Mr. Aldrich is the leader of the senate and certainly one of the ablest statesmen in financial matters in either house. I believe it to be his earnest desire to aid the people."—President Taft in his speech to Boston business men Tuesday, September 14.

THE LEADER DESCRIBED BY A REPUBLICAN PAPER  
In its issue of Monday, June 7, the Kansas City Star, a republican paper, printed this editorial:  
"The faith of Nelson Wilmarth Aldrich in the perfidy and temerity of the republican party and in the subserviency of the people to green goods politics has to be witnessed to be believed. The history of the American government furnishes no parallel to the insults which are now being heaped upon the doctrine of popular government by the senatorial boss from Rhode Island."

THE NEBRASKA ELECTION  
The democrats of Nebraska have nominated for justices of the supreme court John J. Sullivan of Douglas county, James R. Dean of Custer county and Benjamin F. Good of Saunders county. Judge Sullivan served one term on the supreme bench and he made a record that is unsurpassed in the history of that court. He is recognized as one of the great lawyers of the west and the people of Nebraska are, indeed, fortunate in having the opportunity of choosing so capable a man. Judge Dean is now a member of the court. It was Judge Dean who wrote the dissenting opinion in the case where republican judges destroyed the non-partisan judiciary law. That opinion has been printed in full in The Commoner and it has been accepted by lawyers generally as a clear cut judicial document, while its logic and generally high tone has commanded for it the respect of men of all political parties. Judge Good has served several terms as judge of the district court and throughout his judicial district he is known as an able and upright judge.  
The democrats of Nebraska have reason to be proud of their candidates for the supreme bench and the people of the state will be fortunate, indeed, should Judges Sullivan, Good and Dean be elected.  
The nominees for regent of the State University are Harvey L. Newbranch and Charles T. Knapp. Mr. Knapp is a business man of high standing in the city of Lincoln. Mr. Newbranch is the associate editor of the Omaha World-Herald. Upon him the brunt of the editorial work of that paper has fallen and he has discharged his duty well. His editorials have come to be known throughout the west as models of earnest, scholarly appeals to the intelligence of the people. It is needless to say that the interests of Nebraska's great university would be well served by the election of Messrs. Newbranch and Knapp.

Senator Bailey of Texas replied to Mr. Bryan's speech, speaking at Dallas on the evening of September 18. The senator was given a great reception. The Fort Worth Record, a Bailey champion, gives the following as the "key notes" of the senator's speech:

If, therefore, Mr. Bryan finds it necessary for the democracy of Texas to reverse its position in order to harmonize itself with his views, he must undertake the larger task of inducing the democracy of the entire country to repudiate the tariff plank of the platform on which he received his first nomination for the presidency.

I stand uncovered in the presence of the people, and I say to them with religious sincerity, "Thy will be done;" but whenever it is their will that something shall be done that I can not in good conscience do, I will give them back their senatorship and let them bestow it on some man who can execute their will without doing violence to his conscience. That is the way, and that is the only way, to preserve a representative government.

By levying a duty on a larger number of articles, we will be able to make the duty lower on every article, and by distributing these duties over the largest possible area, we will neutralize and minimize the evil effect of protection. To make my meaning plain, let us suppose that with a given amount of money to collect through the customs houses, one-half was to be collected on raw materials, and one-half on manufactured articles. If we were to transfer by one stroke of the pen all raw materials from the dutiable list to the free list, it would become necessary at once for the government to collect twice as much from the articles still remaining on the dutiable list in order to supply the full amount of revenue which the customs houses were required to furnish; and the people who manufacture the articles still left on the dutiable list would enjoy the privilege of buying their raw material under free trade conditions, and then selling the products manufactured out of that free raw material at a price enhanced by the duty on them.

I do not intend to indulge in any personal criticism, for it is my earnest desire and it shall be my steadfast purpose to keep this discussion on the high plane of principles, and to eschew all personalities; but I think it permissible and proper for me to say that there was a time when Mr. Bryan did not regard a democratic platform exactly "as a Christian regards the Ten Commandments."

If Mr. Bryan had a right, in obedience to the platform of his district and in pursuance of his personal declaration, to vote against the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on the issue of state banks, I had a right to vote against repealing the tax on wood pulp, print paper and lumber in obedience to the platform of my state and in accordance with my repeated declarations.

And my answer to those who demand free raw material in order that our manufacturers may compete in the markets of the world is that I am willing to take the tax off the raw material whenever they are willing to take the tax off the finished product. I believe that American consumers are as much entitled to the benefit of competition in our markets as American manufacturers are entitled to compete in foreign markets. If we are to have free trade in raw material for the benefit of the American manufacturer abroad let us also have free trade in their finished products for the benefit of American consumers at home.

I do not demand a tax on wool for the purpose of protecting the wool grower any more than Mr. Bryan demands a tax on woolen goods for the purpose of protecting the manufacturer. I advocate a tax on both for the purpose of raising money to support the government, and I contend that it is a gross injustice to relieve the manufacturer from his tax and still collect a tax from his customer. Whenever the government can dispense with the revenue, I am in favor of putting both wool and woolen goods on the free list, but as long as the government must tax the clothes which the millions wear, I shall insist that it shall likewise tax the wool out of which the manufacturers make those clothes, and thus compel the few who are rich to divide the burden of this government with the many who are poor.

The duty on hides yielded in 1907 more than \$2,000,000 of net revenue to the public treasury, while the duty on boots and shoes yielded less than \$30,000; and yet these men tell me that

if I vote for a duty that raises more than \$2,000,000 for the support of the government I am a protectionist, while they can support a duty that brings less than \$30,000 and yet claim to be "tariff for revenue only" democrats.

Of course, I understand that there are a great many country publishers who are none too prosperous, and that even a small relief would be welcome to them; but the amount which the publisher of a country newspaper would save by a repeal of the tax on print paper would not be sufficient to fill the baby's stocking at Christmas time; and the real benefit of such a law would go to the great newspapers, magazines and book houses, whose profits already run into the thousands and even into the millions every year.

I deny that anybody, speaking in the name of the democratic party, had a right to order me to repeal the duty on print paper as long as there is a duty on the hat which covers the farmer's head and the shoes which protect the mechanic's feet. I have no hesitation in declaring that the men who issued that order acted against the well established principles of the democratic party and contrary to the will of Texas democrats whom I have the honor to represent.

Instead of Mr. Bryan's platform of special privilege to the manufacturer, I would enter the campaign of 1912, preaching the doctrine of equal taxation, for in taxation, as in all other things, equality is justice. I would not insist that every raw material shall be subject to a tax, but I would insist that until the finished product can be emancipated for the benefit of the people, the raw material shall not be emancipated for the benefit of the manufacturer. That was the doctrine of our fathers in the days when the democratic party won its most splendid victories and administered this government with such great success; and that must be our doctrine if we ever hope to restore the democratic party to power in this republic.

### BAILEY'S "PITILESS" LOGIC

In an editorial entitled "Bailey's Answer to Bryan," the Ft. Worth (Texas) Record says:

Senator Bailey's reply to Mr. Bryan is a piece of unimpassioned, impersonal and pitiless logic. The mind which Senator Root says "works with the precision of a Corliss engine," was in perfect order and proceeded in measured sequence from clear premise to unanswerable conclusion.

With scrupulous fairness to Mr. Bryan's position and sincere respect for his personality and party status, the senator answers him in detail upon every point of the ground which the Nebraskan chose for the contest. Mr. Bryan may not think that his arguments are "answered" and that he should return to Texas as he promised to do to present new and other arguments if his Dallas and Fort Worth contentions should be refuted, but no unprejudiced man will say, after reviewing the debate, that the Texas view is not justified by the senator's reasoning.

Disclaiming and disproving the purpose of the Texas platform to levy a protective tariff upon raw materials for protection's sake, Senator Bailey shows that there is incidental and inevitable benefit to the man who produces or manufactures any article which is taxed, and he contends that such benefit should be distributed equally or equitably between the producer and the manufacturer. He would construct a tariff, not for protection but for revenue, and would distribute the schedules over such a wide variety of articles of import as to reduce the burden to the consumer upon each article to the minimum and apportion the benefits of the tariff among the greatest number.

The Bryan idea is to attack protection piecemeal, to remove the tariff first from raw materials and trust to good fortune and political power to remove it from manufactured articles. He commits the fatal practical mistake of forgetting that every reduction of revenue or raw materials will require a corresponding increase somewhere on manufactured articles in order to save the government's revenue. And he would compel the producer to suffer a loss while the manufacturer enjoys at least a temporary gain.

The Bailey idea—or more broadly speaking, the Texas idea and the historic democratic idea—is to attack protection all along the line, to compel reductions on manufactured products and raw products at the same time in order to preserve the equities between classes and sections, and to reform the tariff system to the