

people that they may get rich by robbing each other. It is a fraud in that it legalizes piracy on the part of one locality against another. The producers of one commodity are permitted to collect tribute from the producers of some other commodity, who in turn are given right to pilfer some other line of producers. The wider and more extended this system of privilege becomes, the harder it will be for the government to eradicate it.

This tariff pauper differs from the ordinary pauper, in that in one instance the poorer member of society is supported by the state, while in the other the more opulent is the one supported. The men of millions are the ones benefited by this protection of industry, not those who toil. The evils of this national fraud are far-reaching, and will take us half a century to blot out. No government is in a position to instruct its people in truth and honor which advocates an economic falsehood, and participates in a national game of piracy. The state might as well try to legitimize any other form of piracy upon the high seas, as to attempt to render equitable tariff piracy within the state.

The democracy of the nation, as well as the nation itself faces a crisis. We must not be deluded by the siren song as to temporary "victory." We must not accept a barren victory either of measures or of men. Measures can not be carried out without men who are not afraid. The democratic party is fortunate in having an abundance of presidential timber. Therefore let those who have been on the firing line for years lead the way, and let the recent converts help in the revival. If Mr. Bryan deems it best not to become a candidate, why not Governor Folk? He has been weighed in the balances and not found wanting. Count upon Washington as being progressive. Yours for progressive democracy.

RUSSELL F. COLLINS.

CIRCULATE THE COMMONER

York, Pa., July 5, 1911.—Editor Commoner: I have been a reader of your paper for several years past, and have secured a number of subscribers. Nothing would give me greater satisfaction than to know that your paper went each week into the homes of two millions of Americans citizens. Our country would have a better citizenship, if The Commoner would be read in every state of the union, and if it held the place in the hearts of the people that it does in mine. It gives us information we can not get from any other newspaper. Some of us in York have been noticing each week the column headed, "Watch It Grow." I have taken the trouble several times to count up the number of subscriptions secured in one week. It would be a matter of considerable convenience to your readers if you would give the total number each week. One week I counted it up to more than eleven hundred. Most of our so-called "great dailies," and many of our "weeklies" have exhausted their efforts in ways to secure new subscribers; but I do not believe there has ever been a paper known whose readers were as ready to secure subscribers as have the readers of The Commoner, without being offered a premium.

You had an interesting article on the front page of your last issue, "A Possible Compromise." The manner of choosing United States senators has been discussed among some of us democrats a good deal, and we have been wondering for a long time why no one has suggested allowing the states to use whatever method they see fit. It is worse than absurd, that a few congressmen should be allowed to propose the method by which the states shall select their ambassadors, and then offer them that method, or go on as they have been doing.

The time is long overdue when the states should exercise their sovereignty, and meet together in a body of delegates to revise the constitution. It should be nobody's business outside the citizenship of the state, as to what method is used to select her federal senators, or ambassadors, as some of our great statesmen in the past have chosen to designate them. When the states do assemble in convention to revise the constitution, as they surely will some day, I hope that one of the first points to be considered will be an age limit for the members of congress. The congress has seen fit to put an age limit on officers of the army and navy, and upon members of the federal courts, yet there is no place on earth where there is greater necessity for an age limit than in the congress of the United States. Men are there today who are long past their years of usefulness, while others have served so long that the knowledge gained

STANDING TOGETHER

Representative Finly H. Gray, in the house of representatives: "Along with the tariff on woolen clothing, behind which the woolen manufacturers have entrenched themselves for fifty years to exact millions in tribute annually from the people, there is a tariff on raw wool, placed there and kept there at the demands of the woolen manufacturers themselves. And while this tariff would have the effect, if allowed to operate, to increase the cost of the manufacturers' raw material, yet we are confronted with the spectacle of the woolen manufacturers, their agents, attorneys and special representatives entreating and imploring congress to allow the tariff on wool to remain, and to permit them to continue the payment of a tax on their raw material. "Why have the woolen manufacturers thus demanded and why are they still demanding a tariff upon wool and asking to be permitted to continue the payment of this tax? Let no man be deceived in their purpose. It is a stratagem to gain the wool grower's support for a tariff upon manufactured wool, to blind him with self-interest, to make him a party to the crime of extortion and close his mouth against the evils of private monopoly and the exploitation of the consumers of woolen clothing."

in long service is invariably used to thwart legislation in the interest of the people. Twelve years in the senate, or fourteen years in the house, should be long enough for any man to serve in the congress. I know that some will answer that many of our greatest statesmen have done their best work after serving long terms, but I would answer that by stating that more of them have done their poorest work after serving long terms in the congress.

Let us consider this suggestion a little and see what it would do for the present congress, if no one was allowed to sit in that body who had passed the age of seventy years, and if no one would be allowed to serve more than fourteen years in the house, or twelve years in the senate.

The spectacle of the United States senate being in session three months without accomplishing more than should be done in one month, seems to me a conclusive argument against allowing old men, and men of more than two terms to be there. Yours truly, F. W. BIGGER.

MR. BRYAN'S PLAN

Mr. Bryan's suggestion of a basis of compromise between the house and the senate in the controversy over federal control in the direct election of senators is worthy of consideration. His proposal, as reported from Washington, is to give the states authority to elect as they choose, either indirectly through the legislature or directly by vote of the people.

He is confident, no doubt, that nearly all if not all would select the latter method, and that the legislatures would be compelled by public sentiment to grant the privilege of a direct vote.

Aside from the fact that this plan is offered as a compromise it has a value. There may be states in which opinion inclines heavily toward the indirect method, states in which general assemblies have served admirably the purpose of selecting men for the upper branch of the national legislature, states which have found the provisions of the constitution as it stands entirely suited to their needs.

This is not the case with the majority, and for that reason it is safe to assume that authority to change the method of election once given would be used quickly. In any case Mr. Bryan's plan is designed to remove most of the opposition to the change.—Chicago Tribune.

IN MISSOURI

Senator Reed of Missouri calls attention to the fact that the Missouri democratic state convention last year endorsed Joseph W. Folk as Missouri's candidate for the presidency. So far as 1912 is concerned Senator Reed adds: "The Missouri delegation to the national convention will be a delegation devoted to the support of Governor Folk."

Practical Tariff Talks

One effect of the reduction of the wool tariff will be the breaking of the power of price-fixing now possessed by the woolen trust. One reason for the universal objection to the present Schedule K is that under it the trust has not only told the wool grower what he should get for his product, but it has permitted that trust to say to the jobber at what price he should sell its products. Ample proof of this market control can be shown whenever necessity arises. The basis of this control, of course, lies in the manner in which the old schedule was drawn. It was a direct inducement for combination, and under the Dingley law this conspiracy in restraint of trade reached its maximum of power. Just what that power is may be learned in part by a study of the tables of imports and exports.

In 1909 there were produced in the United States worsted and woolen goods to the value of \$420,000,000, and a total of all woolen manufacturers of \$515,000,000. For that year our imports were \$18,000,000 and our exports \$2,000,000. Reduced to percentages this means that of our total consumption but 3 1/2 per cent came from abroad, while we sent abroad less than one-half of 1 per cent of what we produced. In the matter of cloth alone our imports were approximately 3 per cent of our production. This is the clearest possible proof of the prohibitory character of the tariff schedules. Now in practically every other department of American manufactures our exports are considerable. Why are they practically negligible in woolen cloths? It is not because our workmen in the woolen mills are less skilful than those in our steel mills. The productive power of the American worker is greater than that of the English worker in a number of industries, as investigation has disclosed. What is there about the making of cloth that prevents that being true in this industry?

In fact the American workmen, in a factory equipped with high grade machinery, produces more goods than does the workman in foreign factories. The proof is furnished by the trust itself. In a circular issued some years ago for the purpose of inducing investment in its stock, this statement was made: "The Washington mills were started under the first administration of President Cleveland, and despite the vagaries of the tariff for the next twelve years, it prospered and succeeded in an unparalleled degree. The fact is that with the progress that has been made in woolen machinery and the increased skill of our American operatives the woolen business in America is rapidly reaching a position where even a return to the conditions similar to those existing under the Wilson bill would not seriously impair its profitability." While, ordinarily, claims made in a stock-selling campaign are susceptible to heavy discount, the fact recited in this statement coincides precisely with those made in reference to other industries, and—let it be remembered—are evidence presented by the trust itself.

There is but one possible explanation. That is that the home market is so profitable and so large that it is poor business policy to extend production to the point where any considerable quantity of American made cloth must compete in the world's market with cloth from the looms of other countries. To monopolize the American market, great and growing as it is, is sufficient. This monopoly is most complete in the clothes that go into the suits and dresses of the middle and lower classes because it is upon these that the highest tariff is levied. This results in restricting imports to those goods used by the wealthier classes. On cloth valued at 40 cents a pound or less—which means about 40 cents a yard wholesale—the tariff is 144.05 per cent. On that between 40 and 70 cents a pound the tariff is 123.55 per cent, while on that above 70 cents a pound the duty is 96 per cent. The result of this rank discrimination in favor of the rich is thus shown in the importations: On the higher-priced cloths the revenue was \$5,827,776.80; on the next highest it was \$274,246.50, while on the lowest-priced it was but \$2,111. The real meaning of this is that the average man has been left by the Payne-Aldrich law at the mercy of the woolen trust—and it knows no mercy. The bill proposed by the democrats levies an average of 40 per cent on cloth, instead of 144.05 per cent. C. Q. D.