

\* rail but could carry a ground chunk. When the men found a fence corner that needed to be raised, they would put one end of a rail under the fence corner and then they would call to me to bring a ground chunk. I would select the biggest one that I could carry or drag and put it under the rail. Then they would bear down on the end of the rail and the fence corner would go up.

Now I never boasted that I was a precocious child or bragged about how early I began to know things, but I hope you will not consider me egotistical when I say that, young as I was, I had sense enough to know that there was some pressure on the ground chunk when that fence corner was raised.

This illustrates the operation of a protective tariff. You can raise a fence corner with a rail if you have a ground chunk to put under the rail, but you can not do it without putting a pressure upon the ground chunk. And so you can raise an industry with a protective tariff law but you must have a consumer to act as a fulcrum. The consumer is the ground chunk, and there is a pressure on him when an industry is raised by means of a protective tariff. You have about four million and a half of people in Texas, and you have to make ground chunks out of them when you raise the price of lumber by means of a protective tariff.

I speak of the Kirby Lumber company because I understand it is the largest lumber company in Texas. If you have any other lumber company that profits more by a protective tariff than the Kirby Lumber company, give me its name, and I will use it as an illustration next time. I believe that a protective tariff is robbery under a form of law. The beneficiaries of protection put up the campaign funds, and they expect that those whom they elect will return the money in the form of legislation which will permit them to keep their larcenous hands in the pockets of the people.

I do not know how much I may be able to do for the benefit of my country. I am not anxious to leave a large fortune to my children, but I desire to leave them something better than a fortune. I desire to leave them a good government which will protect all citizens in the enjoyment of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness and guarantee to them a fair share of the proceeds of their own toil. With such a government I am willing that my children shall take their chances with other people's children. I want to leave the avenue of advance open to the children of the humblest in this land. I want it so that any man who aspires to office can have a chance to secure the support of those who believe in the things that he stands for. God forbid that the policy of protection shall so spread over this land that an aspirant for office must get down on his knees and ask the beneficiaries of protection for the privilege of becoming a candidate for office before the people.

When I go east I recognize that wealth is more concentrated there and that the average man does not have as good a chance as he has in the west and south. I believe that the protective system is largely to blame for this. I have fought the policy of protection in Nebraska, and I am fighting it everywhere, and I mistake the intelligence and patriotism of the people of this state if they can be induced to endorse this doctrine. I oppose it here and everywhere as an abominable system under which the few profit at the expense of the many and then corrupt politics and government that they may continue to profit.

I appreciate the attendance here this afternoon; I appreciate the cordial reception you have accorded me and the endorsement you have given to the arguments presented, and I appreciate the support which you have given in the past. I stand for the doctrine that there should be no tax for the purpose of protecting special interests whether in Texas or elsewhere, and I shall rejoice if, when you meet in convention, you decide to stand in harmony with the democracy of the nation on this subject. If you turn against our party's position, I shall mourn until you come back, but I know that your hearts are right and that in time you will stand with us for the Jeffersonian doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

#### ONLY ECHO ANSWERS

The question is: "Is an official bound by the platform pledge, or is he free to act as he pleases, regardless of promises made in the platform?" That is the question Mr. Bryan propounds to Senator Bailey, and only echo answers.—Dallas (Texas) News.

## Texans Fight for Free Raw Material

The newspapers of September 29 printed this Associated Press dispatch:

Atlanta, Ga., September 28.—A joint debate on the tariff bill by William J. Bryan and Senator Joseph W. Bailey of Texas at Atlanta is assured, the meeting to be held some time next month in the new auditorium here.

Today Senator Bailey wired his acceptance of the formal invitation extended by the Young Men's Democratic League of Atlanta for the debate. While no reply to the invitation has been returned from Mr. Bryan, advices from Fort Worth, Texas, are to the effect that Mr. Bailey wired Mr. Bryan of his acceptance of the invitation, incorporating in his message to the former democratic standard bearer a personal request that he, too, accept and fix the date of the meeting.

Mr. Bryan will arrive at his home, Lincoln, Neb., tomorrow and is expected to formally accept the invitation and suggest a suitable date.

The democratic convention of Texas opposed the plank in the national democratic platform declaring for free raw material, and Senator Bailey attacked that feature of the party's platform on the floor of the senate. Mr. Bryan went to Texas about two weeks ago, and, in a number of speeches, assailed the attitude of Mr. Bailey on this subject, the latter defending his position from platforms in various parts of the state.

Following is an Associated Press dispatch:

Atlanta, Ga., September 29.—With regard to the joint debate on the tariff between himself and W. J. Bryan at the auditorium here, Senator Joseph W. Bailey of Texas today sent the following telegram to the Atlanta Young Men's Democratic League:

"I authorized my friends at El Paso to arrange a joint discussion between Mr. Bryan and myself and they undertook to do so, but he objected on the ground that it would militate against democratic success in the next congressional election. In view of that statement by him I am not willing to put myself in the position of urging him to do what he thinks would be against the interests of our party, but if he should change his mind about the matter and consent to the arrangement you propose it would please me very much to discuss the question of raw material with him at Atlanta whenever it may suit his convenience."

The following telegram was received here tonight from Mr. Bryan at Lincoln:

"Engagements are made for my time until November, but I shall be glad to make a tariff speech in Atlanta some time in November or December. I consider a debate objectionable, however, for reasons which I will communicate by letter."

The following letter explains itself:

September 30, 1909.—Hon. Clark Howell, Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, Ga. My Dear Mr. Howell: I wired you last night that I would communicate with you by letter my reasons for believing a debate inadvisable. When a joint meeting was suggested at El Paso, Texas, I replied to the effect that I am trying to aid in the election of a democratic majority in the next congress; that to that end I have suggested a brief but specific tariff plank which I ask democratic candidates to accept, reject or amend and that, believing a debate would tend to turn attention from the issue to individuals, I would not consider the proposition unless it came as a personal request. I might add the further reason that a debate between two democrats would accentuate the tariff differences that have embarrassed our party in congress and give the republican newspapers a chance to dwell upon democratic dissensions instead of devoting their time to the contest now being waged between the progressive republicans and the standpatters. A debate might be pleasing to the participants and entertaining to the audience, but I think that the subject which I am endeavoring to present is worthy of calm and serious consideration.

Very truly yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

#### SENATOR BAILEY ON PARTY FEALTY

In order that there may be no possibility of a misunderstanding as to Senator Bailey's views regarding party fealty, the Chronicle reproduces his two most famous utterances on this point.

From Senator Bailey's famous "hate" speech

delivered at Austin before the legislature, February 27, 1907:

"This legislature ought not to adjourn until it has amended section 124 of that election law so as to make it impossible for a man ever again to accept the people's office and then violate the people's instruction."

From Senator Bailey's address delivered at Turner hall, in Houston, September 22, 1909:

"The platform did command me to take the duty off of four articles and I refused to do it, and I don't hide behind the proposition that I was not elected on that platform either."—Houston Chronicle.

#### AN UNANSWERED QUESTION

The Dallas (Texas) Morning News, referring to Senator Bailey's speech at Houston, says:

One question went unanswered, however; it was given while Senator Bailey was discussing his vote on the tariff on iron ore.

"They say that the steel trust owns 80 per cent of the iron ore in the country," said Senator Bailey; "as a matter of fact the trust owns only about 50 per cent of it, but admitting for the sake of argument that it does own 80 per cent, it would not hurt the trust any if iron ore was taxed or came in free."

"It would give independent manufacturers a chance to exist if it came in free, wouldn't it?" said a man near the press tables.

The question was evidently not heard by Senator Bailey, as he continued without hesitation into a discussion of the matter of taxing finished iron articles and the manufacturer being allowed to secure his raw material duty free.

#### SOPHISTRY

(Editorial in Dallas, Texas, News)

"A compensatory duty," Senator Bailey exclaims, "is a thing no democrat ever advocated from the foundation of the republic." Neither did Mr. Bryan. The plain and unmistakable meaning of what he said was that it has been the practice of the republicans to compensate manufacturers for any duty levied on raw materials, and that, therefore, those who demand a duty on raw materials give the republicans an excuse to advance the duties on the articles into which those raw materials are manufactured. Each of those propositions is indisputably true. Instances of it are on every page of protectionism's history. It is a notorious fact that the organized sheep growers of Ohio, Wyoming and Montana worked before the ways and means committee in perfect concord with the lobbyists of the woolen manufacturers. Each helped the other to get what it wanted; and Senator Bailey's course, instead of being one that tends to bring about justice as among the producers, the manufacturer and the consumer, is one that must inevitably result in a partnership between the producer and the manufacturer for the exploitation of the consumer. Indeed, so devious is his logic that he is not able to maintain consistency between different parts of the same speech; for after accusing Mr. Bryan of advocating compensatory duties, he says, in the next column but one, that Mr. Bryan proposes "the abolition of the compensatory duty" on woollens, and he plumes himself on having predicted that he must. There are few men, we imagine, who care to make their inconsistencies the occasion of a boast.

Although it is a repetition, and therefore lacks novelty, Senator Bailey's proposition that the price of a manufactured article is not governed by the cost of the raw material is perhaps the most resplendent absurdity of the whole speech. As a discovery in the realm of political economy, that is quite as remarkable as any geographical that has been made in the region of the north pole.

Senator Bailey says that as you raise the tariff rates on raw material you reduce the manufacturer's profit, and that as you lower the tariff rate on raw material you increase his profit. Consistently with that unique theory, he declares that the consumer is not affected one way or the other by the tariff rate on the raw material. "You don't buy wool," is the irresistible argument he hurls at you. The manufacturer's selling price, he says, is governed by the tariff rate on the manufactured article.

If it were true that the manufacturer's profit is reduced by advancing the tariff rate on his raw material, then to put a trust out of business we should merely have to elevate the duty