

Mr. Bryan's Nebraska Tour

Following is a special dispatch, printed in the Omaha World-Herald: Lincoln, Neb., Sept. 27.—Chairman J. C. Byrnes of the democratic state central committee, this afternoon gave out the speaking engagements for W. J. Bryan in Nebraska which have been completed up to the present time. The tour through the north-eastern part of the state has not yet been completed and the dates will be announced later. The completed list contemplates forty-three speeches. The tour through the northeastern part of the state and other dates not announced will probably bring the total to sixty.

These speeches will be made in the interests of the democratic state ticket. A considerable part of the time, however, will probably be occupied by Mr. Bryan in a discussion of national issues. The itinerary follows: Thursday, October 5, Elmwood 11 a. m., Syracuse 3:30 p. m., Auburn, 8 p. m.; Friday, October 6, Tecumseh 11 a. m., Pawnee 3.30 p. m., Falls City, 8 p. m.; Saturday, October 7, Fairbury 11 a. m.;

Wymore 3:30 p. m., Beatrice 8 p. m.; Monday, October 9, Seward 11 a. m., Hebron 8 p. m.; Tuesday October 10, Geneva 11 a. m., York 3:30 p. m., Aurora 8 p. m.; Wednesday, October 11, Clay Center 11 a. m., Superior 3:30 p. m., Red Cloud 8 p. m.; Thursday, October 12, Bloomington 11 a. m., Orleans 3:30 p. m., Beaver City, 8 p. m.; Friday, October 13, Cambridge 11 a. m., Elwood 3:30 p. m., Holdrege 8 p. m.; Saturday, October 14, Minden 11 a. m., Kearney 3:30 p. m., North Platte 8 p. m.; Monday, October 16, Lexington 11 a. m., Eddyville 3:30 p. m., Broken Bow 8 p. m.; Tuesday, October 17, Loup City 11 a. m., Ord 3:30 p. m., Greeley 8 p. m.; Wednesday, October 18, St. Paul 11 a. m.; Hastings 3:30 p. m., Grand Island 8 p. m.; Thursday, October 19, Central City 11 a. m., Schuyler 3:30 p. m., Columbus, 8 p. m.; Friday, October 20, Central City 11 a. m., Fullerton 3:30 p. m., Osceola 8 p. m.; Saturday, October 21, David City 11 a. m., Wahoo 3:30 p. m., Fremont 8 p. m.

IN THE THIRD NEBRASKA DISTRICT

The democrats of the Third Nebraska district met at Norfolk, Neb., for the purpose of nominating a candidate to succeed the late Congressman James P. Latta. On the first formal ballot Dan V. Stephens of Fremont was nominated. Resolutions were adopted as follows:

"We, the democrats of the Third congressional district, in convention assembled:

"Heartily indorse the last democratic national and state platforms, and insofar as they touch questions of import in the pending congressional campaign, we adopt them literally and make them part and parcel of this declaration of principles:

"We especially commend the democratic majority in the present house of congress for the constructive ability displayed in the late special session, and for the honest effort to relieve the country from many of the oppressive and the unjust provisions of the republican tariff schedules, and we regret that a republican president saw fit to destroy with his veto so much legislation in the interest of the whole people.

"We are opposed to the secret political caucus. Politics in the interest of the people does not fear the light nor seek the shades of secrecy. We pledge the nominee of this convention in his capacity as a member of congress to earnest and faithful effort for the enactment of legislation in harmony with the best progressive thought of the country, no matter from what source such proposed legislation may reach the halls of congress.

"We send a message of greeting and good cheer to Nebraska's first citizen and democrat, William J. Bryan, and bid him godspeed in his noble work of carrying to the uttermost parts of our nation the true principles of democracy as they were first proclaimed by Thomas Jefferson and later exemplified by Andrew Jackson and in this day so safely applied by the democratic majority in congress in effort to enact legislation which will work the greatest good to the greatest number."

The resolutions committee was as follows: W. H. Green, Creighton, chairman; G. L. Loomis, Fremont; H. E. Phelps, Howells; Mayor Bishop, Central City; Edgar Howard, Columbus; Judge Cowan, Stanton; Mark Murray, Pender; J. W. Rice, Neligh.

The Norfolk News report says: "As the last paragraph of the resolutions was read, praising Bryan, great cheers arose in the convention."

WHAT THEY SAY ABOUT DAN V. STEPHENS

Stanton (Neb.) Register: Dan Stephens is an ideal candidate and one who has the ability and courage to represent this district right.

Creighton (Neb.) Liberal: The nomination of Dan V. Stephens for congress (in the Third Nebraska district) last Tuesday had been foreshadowed ever since the death of Mr. Latta. Stephens has a likeable personality and in the past six years he has made the personal acquaintance of a large number of the voters of this district. Politically Mr. Stephens has always been right and it was his wish, expressed before the resolutions committee, that partisanship would not stand in his way in supporting progressive measures. The La Follette republicans of this district will be able to tell where Mr. Stephens stands on the questions now agi-

tating the people. The question of majority is all the question there is over Mr. Stephens' election.

Norfolk (Neb.) Press: Every man in the Third district would vote for Dan if they knew him as his friends know him. He is big, broad, clean, and not afraid to tell any man the truth. He is a natural leader and a clean fighter. There is no skull duggery, no knife-in-the-back business about him. The Press is proud to call him friend and that too considering that Dan and the writer have not always been of the same mind.

Wayne (Neb.) Democrat: Dan Stephens will be in position to do more for Nebraska and this district than any member of the majority party in the house could do, so to us it appears that it would be wise to make the election of Dan Stephens unanimous.

Practical Tariff Talks

In considering the pleas made by President Taft on behalf of his veto of the democratic wool tariff bill and in defense of his tariff board method of determining a proper basis for future tariff legislation, the fact should not be overlooked that under the law creating that board it is provided that whatever data, facts or conclusions the board reaches in its investigation of any schedule, are to be communicated, not to congress, for whose special benefit it is to be gathered, but to the president himself. That board is not to communicate the results of its investigations to the body charged with the duty of making tariff bills, but is to remain under the control of the president, to make public or to be withheld as he pleases. The opportunity is presented, under this procedure, of allowing congress to know only what the president desires it to know. How great a confidence is it possible to place in data gathered and communicated under such restrictions?

The president complains of the wool bill which he vetoed that it was not based on any accurate information of which he had been made aware. Whose fault was this? When the democratic house ways and means committee was molding this bill it made a request of the tariff board that it communicate to the committee whatever information it possessed that would be of value in the task then under way. It was known and is true that at the time the board had practically completed its investigation of the cost of woolgrowing in Ohio and other sections of the United States, sections which, for obvious reasons, must represent the maximum of woolgrowing cost. This information was denied the committee, upon the instruction of the president. Both the board and Mr. Taft took the position apparently that they were the judges of what part of the data would be of service in revising the tariff, and it comes with poor grace from the president to accuse the committee of proceeding without accurate information of the woolgrowing industry when he withheld or caused to be withheld information that he assures the people is most accurate?

This is not the first time that a president of the United States, in an apparently honest

desire to secure information upon which a proper tariff bill, from the protectionist standpoint, might be molded, caused information to be gathered. In 1891 President Harrison caused the commissioner of labor to send a corps of experts into the factories of Europe and America in quest of accurate information as to labor cost. Mr. Harrison was a believer in the protectionist doctrine that the rate of duty ought to represent the difference in labor cost here and abroad, and not knowing what that labor cost, either here or abroad, was why he caused inquiry to be made. In May, 1892, Labor Commissioner Wright submitted a report covering this matter with respect to several industries, the cotton and wool among them. With respect to cotton it was found that the labor cost in the United States, in selected factories, was 27.44 per cent of the total cost, while in England it was 20.33 per cent.

Comprehensive reports were also submitted with respect to the woolen manufacturers. Thirty establishments in the United States were studied, and the labor cost was figured to be \$982,981 of the total cost of \$4,705,112, or 20.80 per cent. This report embraced transcripts of the testimony brought out by hearings of the British tariff commission in which it was shown that the labor cost represented from 14 to 24 per cent of the total cost of production. These reports were submitted to congress, and are among its archives today. Twice after the republican party, which pretends to be devoted to this principle of protection on behalf of the laboring man—in 1897 and in 1909—passed tariff laws in which the cotton cloth schedules carried from 33 to 51 per cent, protection and woolen cloths averaging over 100 per cent. Having the power to fix duties in accordance with the protective idea it pretends allegiance to and having before it information—the Wright report is by no means all that is on file—it re-enacted the same high prohibitive duties that have generally existed for fifty years. It could not and did not plead ignorance, the showing of fact made by Dolliver and La Follette going unrefuted to and uncontradicted and also disregarded. If on the pretense of revising the tariff again as soon as the president's board reports as to facts upon which to make a scientific revision, can the republican party be trusted to do what it has, under similar circumstances, refused and neglected heretofore to do? C. Q. D.

JUDGES ARE MEN

That courts are not entirely above criticism was the opinion of the late Senator George F. Hoar of Massachusetts, who, while a member of the house of representatives in 1876, said: "My own public life has been a very brief and insignificant one, extending very little beyond the duration of a single term of senatorial office. But in that brief period I have seen five judges of a high court of the United States driven from office by threats of impeachment for corruption or maladministration. I have seen in the state of the union foremost in power and wealth four judges of her courts impeached for corruption."

SENATOR MYERS OF MONTANA

Hamilton, Mont., Sept. 23, 1911.—C. W. Bryan, publisher The Commoner, Lincoln, Neb: In a few days I leave for Washington city to give my attention to departmental matters. I will ask you to kindly change the address of The Commoner back to Washington, D. C.

I am glad to report that I find democratic prospects in Montana fine and most encouraging. With a good nominee for president, who is in good touch with the masses of the people and responsive to their needs and demands, I feel sure that democracy will next year carry Montana. Yours truly, H. L. MYERS.

APPRECIATED IN MARYLAND

Stephen P. Jump, Md: Enclosed I hand you check for \$5.80 to cover seven subscriptions to The Commoner. I would like to have increased this list. The people of Maryland have clearly demonstrated that they are favorable to democracy as demonstrated in the late primaries. Undoubtedly The Commoner is fully entitled to a share of credit—it has advocated progressive democracy all down the line. Long live the editor and his good works.