

# NEW ARRIVALS IN OUR ART DEPARTMENT ON THE BALCONY

Fancy Scrims and Madras in all the very latest designs and colors . . . 15c to 30c

New Tapestry by the Yard

Plain and Stripes suitable for Couch Covers, Draperies and Pillows . . . 40c to \$1.25

New Bungalow Net

Come in Brown and Greens. Most beautiful designs 36 inches wide, yard . . . \$1.00

A Large Assortment of Lace Curtains  
AT POPULAR PRICES

The Latest Barred Effects. Plain Nets and Fancy. Come in White and Ecru, per pair \$2.50 to \$5.50

JUST RECEIVED a new lot of Embroidery Floss, Embroidery Hoops and Initials, also a large lot of D. M. C. Embroidery Cotton.

## Hair Goods Specials

- \$10.00 Hair Switches \$6.95
- \$9.00 Hair Switches \$6.15
- \$7.50 Hair Switches \$5.45
- \$6.50 Hair Switches \$4.25

These Switches are all 3 Strands and of the Finest Human Hair, We have any Shade you should wish

Another shipment of Fine Gingham received, Come in Plain Tones and fine Checks and Stripes for yard . . . 15c

Our Complete Assortment of fine Novelty Silks \$1.25 Values reduced to . . . 85c

# THE PEOPLES WAREHOUSE

Where it Pays to Trade

## STANDPATTERS ARE DENOUNCED

(Continued from page 1.)

came into existence as a protest against the inaction of the whigs, and the medieval tendencies of the democrats, and remembering, too, that for more than a half century it has been the progressive party of the union, I cannot permit myself to doubt that the party of Lincoln, of Grant, of Blaine, of Garfield, of McKinley and of Roosevelt will rise triumphantly above the clouds of its civil war and be in the future, as it has been in the past, the best hope of mankind, the progressive party, not only of the nation but of the world.

I understand perfectly that there are some short-sighted men amongst us who will continue either to bewail or denounce individual independence, and who will deplore free criticism of party leaders and party acts, believing that to be independent of an assumed leadership and to give expression to honest criticism of a party measure is to destroy party unity, and to invite democratic victory. Such men disparage both the intelligence and the patriotism of the people. The voters of the country know that there is infinitely more hope of making the republican party effectively progressive than there is of efficient and comprehensive legislation from the democrats.

**Concerning Democrats.**  
There are many democrats who are distinguished for their wise and broad views upon public affairs, but the large majority of the leaders of the democratic party are incapable of making or administering laws for a country like ours, for they invariably find in the constitution an insuperable obstacle in the way of doing the things which are imperatively demanded, and which if done at all must be done by the general government.

I have been accused oftentimes by some of my blind and passionate opponents of having democratic leanings, and I have many warm personal friends in that organization, but there never was a time in my whole life when I would have been willing to

commit the destiny of the country to the democratic party, and there is less reason now for doing so than ever before.

So long as I look upon the constitution as a command to look after the welfare of the people, rather than a mere injunction against invading the rights of the states, there will be an impassable gulf between the democratic party and myself.

The character of the problems which now hold the first place in the American mind makes the republican view of the constitution vital to the common good. I admit that the differences between republicans are many and that they are important; but any republican who, by reason of these differences votes for a democratic candidate, will find that he has jumped from the frying pan into the fire.

**Vote for Party Candidates.**  
I reiterate what I have always said in every campaign during the stormy decade in which I have been in public office. We will fight with all the strength that is in us before the nominations are made, but when they are made in the appointed way we will stand shoulder to shoulder for the republican candidates, and in this spirit I appeal to every republican in the state to give his voice and his vote to every candidate on the ticket, whether national or state.

**Protection.**  
With these preliminary observations, I proceed to the consideration of the definite principles which touch our party faith and which make up our party history. The policy of taxing imports, not only for revenue but for protection to domestic producers, established in the very beginning by Alexander Hamilton, adopted by the whigs, and inherited by the republican party, has beyond dispute helped to make the United States the mightiest nation in the world.  
There is not a republican anywhere who does not yield to the protective system unreserved and unwavering allegiance. Aldrich, Lodge, Hale, Cannon, Payne and Dezell may be its sincere and earnest advocates, but its eloquence of its defense they cannot surpass Nelson, Clapp, Beveridge, LaFollette, Dooliver and Bristow.

There has been no controversy, and there can be none, between republicans as to the soundness or value of this doctrine. The divergence appears when we come to apply it to international trade, and to a consideration of that divergence I now ask your

fairminded and dispassionate attention.

So long as there was full and free competition in our own country it mattered little how excessive the duties were, because the rivalry among domestic producers could be depended upon to bring prices to a fair American level. We did not, therefore, seriously concern ourselves about a scientific adjustment of the tariff. Our manufacturers were protected against competition from abroad, and our consumers were protected by the natural laws of business at home. If the duties were higher than they should have been, and undoubtedly they were in many instances, there was no complaint for no injury resulted to the great body of the people who bought and used dutiable commodities.

As time passed on, however, there appeared a new factor in the industrial and commercial life of the United States, and the era of competition and monopoly began. With a rapidity that even now it is hard to comprehend, business of all kinds rushed into close union, and scattered capital was drawn into the strong embrace of trusts and consolidations.  
Safe from the competition of other countries, it became the chief object of our manufacturers to destroy competition in their own country. They accomplished their purpose so effectively that years ago in nearly every important field of production prices ceased to be the result of the time-honored laws of trade, and the power of determining profits fell into the hands either of a monopoly or an acknowledged master in protected industry.

Then came a demand for a revision of the tariff. It originated in the necessities of the people, and was founded upon the fundamental instinct of justice. Deprived of the safeguards which competition at home had furnished them, the people knew, without reasoning upon it, that they had a right to an intelligent readjustment of the tariff. They felt that the duties should be so modified that the continued insistence upon unfair prices would expose our manufacturers to the correction of foreign competition.

In this demand there was no disloyalty to the doctrine of protection, although for a short period the beneficiaries of excessive duties succeeded in confusing the issue.

**Standardized Means Monopoly.**  
It was then that the standpatter adopted the name which he now bears and his campaign cry was "Let well

enough alone." The movement, however, was irresistible and the republican national convention of 1903 responding, not only with unanimity but with enthusiasm to the progressive sentiment of the rank and file of the party, not only pledged the incoming congress to a revision of the tariff, but defined the doctrine of protection with a care and precision unknown to any former platform. It solemnly prescribed a rule with which to measure import duties to the end that both producer and consumer, both capital and labor, might share in our prosperity. You remember it well, but nevertheless I quote it.

"The republican party declares unequivocally for a revision of the tariff by a special session of congress immediately following the inauguration of the next president, and commends the steps already taken to this end in the work assigned to the appropriate committees of congress which are now investigating the operation and effect of existing schedules. In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries. We favor the establishment of a maximum rate to be administered by the president under limitations fixed by the law, the maximum to be available to meet discriminations by foreign countries against American goods entering their markets, and the minimum to represent the normal measure of protection at home, the aim and purpose of the republican policy being not only to preserve, without excessive duties, that security against foreign competition which American manufacturers, farmers and producers are entitled, but also to maintain the high standard of living of the wage earners of this country, who are the most direct beneficiaries of the protective system. Between the United States and the Philippines we believe in a free interchange of products with such limitations as to sugar and tobacco as will afford adequate protection to domestic interests."

Upon this pledge, definition and rule we appealed to the country for the election of a republican president and a republican congress. The country, believing profoundly in maintaining our own industries, and reposing implicit faith in the promise that export duties would, in the revision to take place, be measured by the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, elected a republican president and a republican congress.

In redemption of the pledge so made the president convened the new congress in special session, and it did revise the tariff.

I have never been much interested in the debate over the technical proposition that our promise was to revise the tariff downward. Beyond dispute, the people generally expected that it would be revised downward, because they knew that the duties were too high, and they were more than the difference between the cost of production here and elsewhere.

**What the Pledge Was.**  
But whatever may have been said in the campaign, I agree that there was no formal pledge in the platform to revise the tariff downward.  
There was, however, a pledge that it should be revised so that the duties upon protected commodities should be the difference between the cost of producing them here and in other countries, and a fair profit added, and the intent of everybody who considered that our manufacturers should be able to enter our markets and sell their products at a fair price as against their foreign competitors; and it was the further intent that grossly excessive profits growing out of abnormal prices should be prevented by reducing the duties to a point that would admit imports wherever our own manufacturers raised their prices above the level of fairness and decency.

Such was the platform and such was the purpose that it became the duty of congress to carry into effect. I believe that ninety-nine republicans in every hundred desired a revision that would keep faith and accomplish the purpose. I believe that the president wanted to fulfill the promises of the party, and to make good his own declarations; but the leaders of both the house and the senate refused to recognize the party pledge; refused to be guided by the rule which had been announced, and forced through congress a tariff bill without even the pretense of attempting to ascertain or of applying when ascertained, the standard which the party had established.

The bill made many reductions and many increases—but the reductions were of little or no avail for they left the duties still far above the difference in cost of production, and therefore permits the protected manufacturers not only to charge existing prices, but to lift them still higher, and the increases were, in nearly every instance, not only without reason, but without defense in debate.

Some republicans, having done all they could to make the bill what it should have been, finally voted for it, and I have no word of censure for them, for they did what they believed to be their duty. Some of us voted against the bill, and we make no apology for our votes.

**Open Repudiation of Pledges.**  
If there had been an honest attempt to fix duties according to the cost of production I might have yielded my view on the question of fact; but there was no such attempt, and I, for one, refused to follow, and would refuse again to follow Aldrich, Hale, Lodge, Cannon, Payne and Dezell in a sneering, contemptuous open repudiation of my party platform.

It is not a republican measure, although passed by republican votes, for the men who are chiefly responsible for it thought more of swelling the overgrown fortunes of their intimate friends than they thought of the party principles, the party pledge, or the welfare of a long suffering people.

It is said that the law has been successful from a revenue standpoint. This is quite true, but it must be remembered that it is very easy to enlarge the receipts at the custom houses. The democrats could have done that with their condemned and obso-

lete theory of a tariff for revenue only. It is said that it has stimulated business. It may be that it has, for the prize of enormous profits is exceedingly tempting.

It is claimed that the average tax upon dutiable imports is something like one per centum less than under the Dingley act. This may or may not be so, for I have learned to doubt the accuracy of tariff statements, but granting the truth of the statement, what a superb showing it is.

We have revised the tariff in response to an overpowering republican sentiment, and have succeeded in taking off about one-fourth-second of the average imposition upon dutiable goods.

In all that has been said by those who have, during the last year, defended the measure, there has been no claim that we either fixed or tried to fix, the duties according to the cost of production, and yet that is the test, and the only test, by which the act should be tried if we have any regard for our pledged word.

I do not intend to review its schedules upon this occasion. I have done that in another and more appropriate forum, and expect to do again when the time comes. It is no pleasure for me to differ from some of my party associates upon this subject; but there is no exigency which can induce me to say that a thing is good when I believe it to be bad, or to say that it is true when I believe it to be false.

There are many gratifying reductions in the Payne-Aldrich act, but upon the whole it is not a fair exemplification of the protective policy, nor is it an honest performance of our platform promise, and no matter what happens I will tell the truth as I see the truth, about it.

Let me, however, again warn republicans who are of my way of thinking concerning the shortcomings of this measure that the failure of the republican leaders in congress to abide by our platform furnishes no reason for delivering this country into the hands of the democrats.

The one thing that can be said in favor of our recent revision is that it is vastly better than any tariff which the democrats could enact founded upon the exploded theory of levying duties for revenue only. It would be fatal to commit this country to any such doctrine, and I know that republicans have too much patriotism and too much intelligence to punish a mistake in leadership by depriving our party of power, and turning over the government to a political organization which holds a view of the constitution that would paralyze our efforts in dealing with the modern problems of commerce, industry and transportation, and which holds a view of the tariff that if put into execution would bring upon us universal disaster.

**Wipe Out the Blot.**  
The logical, sensible thing to do is to correct our mistake—none but republicans can correct it—and under the impulse of the sentiment, growing now by leaps and bounds everywhere they will correct it and leave the republican name and republican pledge without a stain in all its wonderful history.

Our course it seems to me, is set plainly before us. I do not favor an immediate general revision of the tariff. Indeed I earnestly hope that we may never be compelled to enter another general readjustment of the system.

In our last attempt it was made clearer than ever before first, that some better way must be found than we now have of securing information as to cost here and abroad; and second, that we must amend the schedules separately. As to the first, the way will be found in the creation of an independent, nonpartisan tariff commission, not to change the law, for that is and must remain the work of congress; but to collect and lay before congress and before the people the facts.

When this is done there will be neither high tariff man nor low tariff man who will venture to disregard his duty. Fortunately, the demand for such a commission has become almost unanimous among republicans, and the few who still oppose it will soon disappear from public life.

We have already made a good beginning, for under the strong and persistent recommendations of the president, congress gave him an appropriation which he will use insofar as he has the power to do so, to get the information so necessary to a proper understanding of the subject. The provision is inadequate, but it gives us hope that before long we will be able to establish a commission with full powers and complete equipment.

As to the second, we must insist upon a law, or rule of congress that will allow one schedule to be amended or revised without going over the whole range of the tariff. We must exclude the opportunity for the trades and combinations which now dishonor tariff legislation. We must make it impossible to coerce or bribe a member of congress into voting for what he knows to be wrong in order to get what he believes to be right.

Happily, the movement for such a rule or law is steadily advancing, and it will not be long until it too, will embrace every republican in the land. These evidences of progress cheer the heart of every patriot. We may stand fast for a principle, but we cannot stand still in applying it to the affairs of mankind. We are sweeping along at a pace that is not only exhilarating, but inspiring. The optimist is winning in every race, and in the near future we will see a progressive protective tariff that will safeguard the interests of the producer, shield the rights of the consumer, insure the high privileges of labor, and contest the reasonable demand of capital.

**Railroad Regulation.**  
The most important legislation of the last session of congress was the amendment to the interstate commerce law. The regulation of common carriers is altogether the most difficult undertaking upon which the government has entered, and it will require all the independence which a popular selection of law makers can supply; all the intelligence which general education and specific study can contribute, and all the courage which

the highest type of patriotism can create to carry the government to a safe and just conclusion.

It would be an intricate and trying problem, even if the railroad corporations would cooperate with congress in the effort to enact the proper legislation, but their cooperation is not to be expected. They will, in the future as they have in the past, resist every proposal to increase the efficiency of the regulation and control already in our statutes. Their influence exerted in a thousand ways and flowing in a thousand channels, is oftentimes hard to discover, and always hard to overcome. I realize that in the acrony of the struggle which occurs whenever further regulation is suggested there is danger of reprisals. It is to be hoped, however, that we will go calmly and deliberately forward to the right point, undeterred by their position, and unmoved by prejudice or revenge.

We must do nothing that will withhold from these mighty factors in our industrial life revenues that will be sufficient to bring them to and maintain them at the highest standard of efficiency, and that will reward the capital invested in them fairly and reasonably; but we must not forget that it is the business of the government to see that they exact unjust toll from no man; that they practice no discrimination, and that there is neither favor nor disfavor in the service which they render to the several communities which make up our commercial union.

Altogether the law was greatly strengthened in 1906 under the pulsant and patriotic leadership of Theodore Roosevelt, the experience of four years demonstrated that the power of the interstate commerce commission should be materially enlarged, and we should, if it had passed, as Aldrich so emphatically declared it should pass, would have considered the republican party to eternal disgrace and defeat.

**Another Repudiation.**  
Contrary to our solemn promise in the platform it proposed to repeal the anti-trust law with respect to traffic agreements among railways specifying rates and charges, and to permit such agreements and the rates and charges made under them to go into effect without the approval of the interstate commerce commission.

It proposed to allow a single judge to issue a temporary injunction without notice, restraining the interstate commerce commission from enforcing an order reducing rates, and took away the right of appeal to the supreme court from such an injunction.

It proposed to limit the period in which the commission could suspend changes in rates to sixty days, a period which everybody knew to be altogether insufficient.

It proposed to take away from the commission the power to establish through rates between steam railways and electric railways, thereby subjecting the latter to the arbitrary will of the former.

It proposed to repeal the anti-trust law with respect to the merger and consolidation of railways, and to substitute for it the unreviewable discretion of the commerce court exercised in an ex parte proceeding.

It proposed, in effect, to validate the existing capitalization of railway companies, and the regulation with regard to the future issuance of stocks and bonds was attended by a series of exceptions which practically legalized every known method of overcapitalization.

It proposed to create a useless and expensive court of commerce to do the work which the circuit court now does.

I am glad to be able to say that, with the exception of the court of commerce every one of these proposals found their way to the graveyard of legislative heresy and reaction, and

(Continued on Page Three.)

## The Bad Effects of CONSTIPATION

Impure blood, offensive breath, heavy head, shortness of breath, bilious attacks, fitful sleep, loss of appetite, feverish conditions, all come from one cause—Constipation.

## The Good Effects of BEECHAM'S PILLS

remedy these conditions because they remove the cause. They start the bowels, work the liver, sweeten the breath, cleanse the blood, tone the stomach, clear the head, improve the appetite and bring restful sleep.

The oldest and best corrective medicine before the public is Beecham's Pills.

Sold Everywhere. In boxes 10c. and 25c.