

there by act of congress. Of course, any nullification of the dividing line between judicial and legislative functions, presents a serious question, and one of much larger bearings than those relating to the case in hand—bearings which apply, in fact, to every trust litigation which may hereafter arise in this country. The great strength of a precedent lies in enforcing it, and as the precedent now established cannot be enforced save within the boundaries prescribed by itself, it is manifest that the anti-trust law should be so amended, that by legislative act, all agreements in restraint of trade will be wrong prima facie, and will render those who make them, amenable to the penalties of the law.

New York Sun: The rights of property will not and cannot be substantially or practically affected.

New York World: Corporations that violate the anti-trust law may purge themselves by re-organization after the illegality of their practice is established, and then proceed about their business as before. The Sherman act will ever be a rope of sand.

New York Herald: The business interests of the country for the first time in years, know what the law means, and the path is free to normal activity and prosperity.

New York Tribune: Amendment of the law to make it apply only to "unreasonable" restraint of trade has been seriously considered, but it was wisely left to the courts to develop a workable theory of the act's intent which has now been done.

New York Press: Morally rather than physically, the blow dealt at unlawful monopoly by the United States supreme court in its decision in the Standard Oil case is heavily damaging.

New York Times: The decision of the court and Justice White's illuminating opinion have freed the commerce of the country from the terror that has so long paralyzed its energies.

New York American: There will be many more battles yet to fight against other monopolies to test whether "in the light of reason" they are good or bad.

## Practical Tariff Talks

The lumber schedule has been the subject of several impassioned speeches in congress in the last few weeks, and the division between those representatives who speak for a sectional interest and those who view the question from the standpoint of the general interest has been most marked. Most of the lumber manufacturers, according to the Southern Lumberman, are protectionists, but "it is more on general grounds and the force of old associations and affiliations than from any concern as to the effect directly on the lumber trade of free lumber." The same authority says that much of this sentiment is based upon the fact that they think there should be protection on their finished product because there is protection on most commodities the purchase of which enters into the cost of lumber production.

The truth is easily demonstrable that the only effect of the lumber tariff now is to enhance the value of the standing timber in the country, and this is in the hands of men like Edward Hines, who has figured extensively in the Lorimer investigation as the alleged "angel" for the junior Illinois senator. Protection is necessary only, according to the most rabid of its defenders, when the cost of production at home is greater than it is abroad. They seek, in theory, to even up opportunities for business development, by fixing as the protection necessary the difference between the cost of production between the foreign manufacturer and the home manufacturer. Note how useless this rule becomes in fixing a lumber tariff.

In British Columbia the law requires that all logging shall be done by white labor. The pay ranges from \$3 to \$6 per day, dependent upon what branch of the work is being followed. This is from 10 to 30 per cent more than it costs in the United States. This shows that the American has nothing to fear from the cheap

labor of Canada, because there isn't any cheap labor there. In shingle-making, it is true, the Canadians employ oriental labor, but these men are much slower in doing their work than Americans, and in the end the cost per thousand of shingle-making is greater on the northern side of the border. The Canadians frankly say they would much prefer white labor, but they cannot get it, and are glad, therefore, to hire the Asiatics.

The facts also refute the claim that it costs the American manufacturer more to construct, equip and operate his mills than is the case in Canada. Theodore M. Knappen, a Minneapolis expert and an officer in one of the organizations there that has been working for free lumber for years, states that he has carefully investigated this question and gives this as his conclusion: "The cost of construction, equipment and general operation in Canada is higher in that part of Canada most likely to compete extensively with our lumbermen than in the state. Data we have secured shows that the cost of mills, general machinery and equipment, including logging equipment, is more in Canada than in the United States, by about 30 per cent."

To quote further from Mr. Knappen: "There was a time when the rate of wages paid in Canada was very much lower than in the United States, but that was before the present era of industrial activity and settlement in Canada, which has brought the standard and cost of living and wages in that country to as high and in some parts a higher plane than prevails in the United States. In the matter of wages, American labor has nothing to fear from the effects of free lumber. We have been at considerable pains to collect data bearing on the subject of wages paid and the cost of production in the lumber industry of both countries, and these prove that a continuance of a tariff on lumber cannot be justified on any theory of protection."

So far as the present generation is concerned the supply of timber is fixed. As this supply yearly decreases, the value of all that remains is enhanced, the only limit being the natural one which involves the ability to sell at the price asked. By preventing the lumber of Canada from having free access to our markets, the government is fostering a natural monopoly owned by a few millionaires and enabling them to engage in a speculation in which profits are assured. But that is just what protection breeds, and timber isn't the only monopoly thus favored. C. Q. D.

### WATCH IT GROW

In order to place his views before a larger number of people Mr. Bryan has given instructions that his paper, The Commoner, be sent to every subscriber for a period of two years for the sum of \$1—the regular price for one year.

You are invited to join Mr. Bryan in this great fight. Every Commoner reader can aid greatly if he will secure one or more two-year subscribers at this special rate. This will carry the subscription beyond the presidential campaign.

Frank J. Burns, Kankakee, Ill.—Enclosed herewith I am sending you draft for \$1 for which please send me The Commoner for two years, as per your special campaign offer. I wish I had time to go out and get more subscribers for The Commoner, for I appreciate the work it is doing. At the present stage of the reform movement, too much publicity cannot be given to our side of the issues. With reference to the "Passing of Bryan," I have this to say: The wish is father of the thought. Mr. Bryan was never a greater power in American politics than he is today, and I believe that no single character in American history at any time of his career, has possessed the sway over his fellow-men now possessed by Mr. Bryan. He has accomplished more for his party and the country at large probably than if he had been elected president. Before his advent, our national politics, both parties, were controlled by Wall street and the interests. In 1896 Mr. Bryan wrested the control of the democratic party from Wall street. Prodigious efforts were made to return the control of the party to Wall street. They signally failed, thanks to the matchless leadership of Mr. Bryan. To my mind, the three successive defeats of Mr. Bryan prove his manhood and the true quality of his leadership. Had he been recreant to the interests of the people, he might have been elected in 1900 or 1908. For twelve years he has been educating the people and

leading public opinion in favor of reforms which are almost necessary to the continued life of the republic. Roosevelt, seeing his success with the democratic party, attempted to do the same thing with the republican party, and succeeded for a time, but nullified all his laudable efforts as a disciple of Bryan by foisting such a reactionary as Taft upon the American people, as their president. Whatever popularity Mr. Roosevelt possesses today, he accomplished by acting as a disciple of Bryan. Whether Mr. Bryan ever becomes a candidate for president of the United States again or not, is unimportant. One thing is sure: So long as he lives, he will be the dominating influence in the party, and no reactionary or interest-serving man can ever hope to be the candidate for president of the United States of the democratic party. The democratic majority in the house of representatives are setting about their duty admirably, and under the guidance of Champ Clark, the people can hope for much relief even before the next presidential election, and then the democratic party will be put in control of all the branches of the government, and such progress will be made toward the reforms for which Mr. Bryan has been clamoring, that the old guard will be disrupted, and we can hope for a new era in American politics, with the people once more in control of their government.

The following named have sent in subscribers: Jno. M. Fulton, Ia.; Wm. White, Wis.; M. B. Sterett, Ill.; J. C. O'Brien, Mich.; W. G. Eckert, Pa.; W. C. Smith, Ind.; J. A. Sutton, Cal.; T. B. Henderson, Ky.; W. C. Crosby, Ind.; V. A. Hovey, N. Y.; Michael McNally, Kan.; J. F. Erwin, Wash.; David Mull, Pa.; Albert Forech, Cal.; J. M. Blair, Utah; F. W. Klinshammer, Wis.; C. W. Nash, Wyo.; Jas. Creech, Mo.; R. N. Vermillion, W. Va.; J. T. West, Mo.; Thos. Halpin, Wis.; Chas. H. Lamar, Ill.; Jno. R. Morrow, Pa.; Henry Ashdown, Wis.; Lee Jackson, Va.; W. B. Lawson, N. J.; W. W. Cunningham, Miss.; J. J. Batterton, S. D.; R. A. Weir, O.; Lawrence Reilly, Ia.; G. S. Chenault, Okla.; S. D. Caldwell, Ky.; J. W. McNabb, Okla.; Harry Morris, Ky.; B. H. Jeffers, N. Y.; Jno. W. Siders, O.; W. A. Lowry, O.; W. E. Baxter, Cal.; A. L. Blodgett, Ore.; T. B. Fiehlz, Ill.; I. E. Dushelbeire, N. Y.; H. R. Pickinson, Mich.; J. D. Hill, Tenn.; Chas. A. Davis, O.; Mrs. A. F. Goulding, Ia.; T. J. Rasp, Okla.; C. Slagle, Tenn.; M. C. Hamilton, Tenn.; R. H. Williams, Mo.; Fred Retterer, O.; Louis Lerritz, Mo.; C. A. Haulenbeck, Kan.; C. Huber, O.; Morris Gorin, R. I.; Wm. Long, Mich.; C. E. Brydenburgh, N. Y.; Jas. DuBois, Mich.; C. A. Overlander, Ore.; J. E. Pogue, N. C.; L. Holdington, Wash.; Jno. R. Wood, Ill.; C. E. Burch, Ky.; Thos. Finnegan, Wis.; Martin H. Wallace, R. I.; W. T. Creasler, Cal.; A. C. Murphy, Tex.; J. J. Herbster, Ia.; F. J. Mirlach, Colo.; J. J. Rolans, Okla.; J. B. Sutherland, O.; A. C. White, Idaho; C. H. Chambers, Minn.; J. W. Cole, Ark.; M. W. Farris, Ind.; J. L. Nance, Tex.; Jas. W. Turner, Mo.; A. W. Smith, Kan.; F. B. Morgan, Minn.; M. C. Coy, O.; Henry Heodacker, Ill.; W. A. Ditzler, Pa.; David M. Tice, Md.; Walter Yoeman, O.; A. R. Rosseau, Tex.; Jas. L. Campbell, Cal.; J. T. Phillips, N. D.; W. J. Crawford, Kan.; P. B. Shaffer, O.; V. H. Thomas, Okla.; H. T. Worthing, Neb.; J. E. Miller, Ill.; W. H. Thompson, Neb.; W. M. Sweet, N. Y.; Thos. J. Switzler, Pa.; H. C. Wallace, Mo.; W. M. Parker, Va.; Chas. Wickmore, Mich.; J. M. Goth, Me.; G. C. Oviatt, La.; Jasper Byers, Ill.; E. L. Montgomery, Mich.; W. A. Peterson, Ill.; V. W. Stoesser, N. D.; F. S. Bryne, Mich.; D. P. Norton, N. M.; Byron Mattison, Ia.; J. F. Lucas, Mo.; T. A. Sawhill, Kan.; Susan Look Avery, Ky.; Amanda Beecher, N. Y.; G. C. Shaw, Ky.; J. A. Dunkel, O.; Wm. Bawders, Pa.; J. H. Savage, Neb.; E. A. Shirley, Ia.; Jas. B. Calloway, Okla.; Lewis Schneider, O.; J. S. Hollihan, N. Y.; Asa M. Whetsell, W. Va.; L. L. Ray, Ky.; B. Singer, O.; Hugh Mooney, Mo.; E. J. Zimmerman, Tex.; J. V. Hicks, Minn.; J. R. Johnston, Ky.; F. L. Langford, Ga.; J. E. Spence, Ia.; J. A. Rice, Ala.; J. H. Crampier, Kan.; M. V. DeWitt, Tex.; F. G. Dewey, O.; W. C. Hazel, Tex.; Thos. D. Turner, O.; W. R. Goddard, O.; J. F. Huntzinger, Okla.; J. A. Bryan, Pa.; A. R. Wright, Ia.; F. A. Lans, Ky.; A. F. Speck, O.; Thos. McPherson, Ia.; J. W. Turner, W. Va.; J. M. Blank, Va.; Chas. E. Petty, Kan.; J. L. Bates, N. Y.; R. B. Ash, W. Va.; J. C. Johnson, Ky.; L. N. Larabee, Ind.; Jas. L. Week, Conn.; Geo. W. Butcher, Ky.; H. C. Foote, Mich.; J. W. Stephenson, O.; C. C. Dickinson, D. C.; S. M. Mann, Ore.; W. H. Kettell, Ia.; Mrs. J. W. Miller, Kan.; D. J. Morgan, Tex.; H. C. Titus, Pa.; Jas. Kinsella, Ia.; Jas. Phelps, Mass.; Clinton Texter, Ore.; J. D. Hefton, Cal.; Garrett Demming, Mich.