

finished product after it was spun; but yet it was the raw material of the weaver, and became his finished product when made into cloth, but still was the raw material of the tailor. Now, I confess that this has been a confusing problem to me, and I have been for some time trying to find out where this theory originated. Since I had heard distinguished democrats make this statement I naturally began to read what the great democrats of the past had said and written upon the subject, but I failed to find such a theory advanced by any of them. Then I began to run down republican authorities on republican doctrines, and lo, I found where the chief high priest of protection for the last 30 years in this country had advanced this confusing theory.

Listen to the inspired oracle of this anointed priest:

The doctrine of free raw materials, as advocated by tariff reformers, is a difficult one to enforce in legislation. In the usual division of labor, the finished produce of one man becomes the raw material of his industrial successor.

Mr. Chairman, this language was used by the distinguished ex-senator from Rhode Island when he was slaughtering the Mills bill in the senate in 1888. And I think it would be well hereafter for democrats, when they make this argument, to give Mr. Aldrich due credit for having originated it. (Applause on the democratic side.) I know if they had done this in the past they would have saved me considerable time in looking it up.

Now, my friends, I would say to democrats, beware of quoting this Aldrich doctrine as democratic doctrine, for it is not, but, on the contrary, it is republican doctrine.

Mr. Chairman, if I were writing a tariff bill I would first place on the free list all raw materials out of which are manufactured the necessities of life in order that the people could buy these necessities cheaper than if the raw materials were taxed. Why should not the raw materials out of which the necessities of life are manufactured be placed on the free list? I dare say there is not a member on either side of this house who would vote for a duty on wool if wool were not produced in this country. If the necessity for revenue demanded that a revenue duty be placed on any raw materials, I would place this duty on such raw materials as rubber, silk and such other raw materials as are not produced in this country, and for two reasons: First, because as they would be non-competing articles, whatever the people might pay for the privilege of consuming them would go directly into the public treasury and not into the pockets of the special interests; second, for the reason that when it became necessary to either raise or lower the duties on these articles it would not disturb the business condition of the country. I would place the highest duties on the luxuries of life, the next highest on the comforts of life, and then I would place on the free list just as many of the necessities of life as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I think this would have been a better bill if it had provided for untaxed wool, for then there would have been greater reduction of duties in the finished products. However, it is a great reduction of the duties as laid in the Payne-Aldrich law; a reduction from an average of more than 90 per cent ad valorem to about 42 per cent ad valorem, which is a reduction of about 53 per cent. One of the best things in this bill is the fact that it abolishes all specific and compound duties appearing in the woolen schedule in the present law and substitutes therefor ad valorem duties. Under this bill imported articles of little value will pay a small duty. Not so in the present law, where blankets, flannels, and clothing are taxed, not according to value, but according to weight or square yard. For example, the Payne-Aldrich law has a provision like this:

On blankets and flannels for underwear composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be the same as the duty imposed by this section on 2 pounds of unwashed wool of the first class, or 22 cents, and in addition thereto 30 per cent ad valorem, etc.

Here you find a compound duty composed of a specific and an ad valorem duty combined. Under a tariff like this the cheaper blankets used by the poor are taxed higher than the finer and more expensive blankets used by the rich. This discrimination against the poor and in favor of the rich may be found throughout the Payne-Aldrich law.

Mr. Chairman, if any state legislature in this union should pass a revenue law to raise money to run the state government by placing a provision in such law to tax all houses in the state of not more than \$20,000 the sum of \$100 annually, what do you suppose the people of that

Some Interesting Letters to Congressmen

H. Schlichting's Sons, Merchants, Sheyboygan Falls, Wis.—Hon. M. E. Burke, M. C., Washington, D. C. Dear Sir: I am in receipt of your letter which is a very generous consideration of my letter of inquiry, anent special interests, progressive democrats, platform pledges, and free wool. It appears from what you have to say, particularly the declaration you quote from democratic caucus, that the twenty per cent ad valorem duty on raw wool is necessary because of a deficit caused by republican extravagance, is the same nature of argument employed by a protectionist in defense of his party, his American citizenship or any governmental deprivation.

It further appears that while the democratic platform does not specifically state or call for free wool, yet, by your repeated affirmation that you are in favor of raw wool on the free list you corroborate that which I supposed to be a cardinal principle of democrats, past and present, namely, that raw materials at least be considered from a free list standpoint. This apparent bi-free wool acknowledgement leads us to the question of wisdom of democrats in transgression or repudiation of the party's platform pledges expressed or implied, and I assure you, Mr. Burke, that the sole motive of the questions I advanced were absolutely in the interest of continued harmony and that the house democrats, God bless them, should make no mistake.

Why did not you golden opportunity democrats make up the equivalent of twenty per cent, if necessary, on the long list of articles or others which you mentioned as per the free list bill and forever abdicate as far as you were concerned, the dangerous and time disturbing doctrine that a party's platform, a party's traditions were ever sacred and that the principles so implied should be fulfilled? Once divert from the policy that the party's traditions or its platform pledge is binding, the great mass, "the of, for, and by the people" will not have even a half loaf but no loaf at all.

The prime or paramount consideration, then, it seems to me, could have been easily maintained with less danger to the party's policy, and with a more certain assurance of a democratic senate and president to still further promptings in free-wool and further relief. It would, indeed, be senseless for a progressive democrat to ram his head against a stone wall, but it would be bad, too, and infinitely worse, for reasonable and honest democrats to continually butt such a fortress covered with raw materials, especially so if it had any of the every-day democratic principles inscribed upon it. Such performances would surely set her to the four winds and rip her from her moorings.

Yes, you have done splendid, you have made a magnificent lead and the people are applauding your virtues, and even should you make some mistakes, "This path of man," I would still support you as against the special interest republicans and indorse the very material and substantial reductions for which you endeavor. The supposition you advance as to the republican president and senate should have no terrors for you brave men, for if they oppose you in this work they will oppose you in most any

state would think of it? It can readily be seen that under such a taxing system the man who owned the \$1,000 house would pay annually 10 per cent in state taxes on his investment, while the man who owned the \$20,000 house would pay only one-half of 1 per cent. I dare say no political party could put in force any such statute in any state of the union and remain in power. Yet this is the very policy the republican party pursues in writing the tariff—revenue—laws of the country. What is true of blankets and flannels is also true of woolen clothing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would say to those who believe as I do that this bill does not go quite far enough, be not dismayed, for we should remember that it took the people of Great Britain 40 years to rid themselves of this vicious system of protection. Gentlemen no doubt remember that the agitation for a reduction of the tariff in England began in 1820, when that country was suffering from a highly protective system. How were the reductions in England's tariff laws brought about? Not all at once, but gradually. The first reduction was accomplished under the leadership of Huskisson in the years 1824 to 1827. The agita-

work—else how could one star differ from another star in glory?

Did not Champ Clark say time and again, that they, the president, etc., claimed their tariff bill the best ever placed on the statute books? Can you drive a bargain with the "best ever?" If such three cornered democrats as Mr. Bailey in the senate will come to our relief, the honest, progressive, democratic democrats of this country will at least know why.

You state that \$21,000,000 would be lost to the treasury if wool goes free. When would it cease to be a loss? If this be so, what is congress doing by free trade list process whereby you do not cripple the treasury? You ask, how are we to get bills through the senate and past a republican president with tariff placed on raw rubber and raw silk? It appears to me, the fact, not theory, bread is bread and water is water and that these "best ever" tariff republicans, when we ask bread (half loaf) might hand us a stone.

I would be pleased, however, if the assumption you advance would bring some relief, to which the people are truly entitled, be it ever so little. How could Mr. Clark, and I make no apology in speaking of him, so far forget thoughtful democrats in committing them to apology and explanation. It may command more than his general quota of Latin, French, or Spanish pronunciamentos—all these are nice in their way, but how insignificant when counter to "A little child shall lead them."

Have you read "Democratic Party's Duty," in The Commoner of Feb. 17, 1911, relative to keeping the faith?

It is indeed gratifying to have you manifest such concern against party split, but party ties, friend Burke, we know hold constructive harmony in little ties to the big, not big ties to the little—Mr. Clark and Mr. Underwood notwithstanding. Further, I have no scruples as to your honesty of action but we can not hold too high the fundamental, basic principles of democracy in maintaining the party's tariff stand, like its platform pledges, absolutely binding. The recent rebuke to the republican party was nothing more than the recall in its inception.

In conclusion I beg to thank you and trust when the next national convention convenes I shall see or hear of you fighting for the same courageous democratic democrat principles that the past has known you wanting to do. Wishing you success and that you may continue long and faithful in representative service, I am, yours respectfully,
H. SCHLICHTING.

Los Angeles, Cal., June 3, 1911.—Hon. W. J. Bryan, Lincoln, Neb.: Enclosed you will please find a copy of a letter which I mailed to the Hon. Mr. Underwood.

I believe that the stand that you are taking to be strictly democratic and that it would be a great benefit to the poor American people.

Wishing you success, I beg to remain, yours very respectfully,
E. W. HOWETH.

Los Angeles, Cal., June 1, 1911.—Hon. Mr. Underwood, Member of House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.: I, in common with the democrats of this part of California, deplore very

tion for still greater reductions continued, when in the years 1841, 1842, and 1843, under the leadership of Sir Robert Peel, a new tariff bill was passed through parliament making great reductions in the then tariff law which had been written by Huskisson in the years 1824 to 1827. The next step taken by Peel was the repeal of the protective tariff on corn, or the abolition of the famous corn laws, that his people might have cheaper bread in order to sustain life. Finally, the last stage in the reduction of the protective system of Great Britain was accomplished under the leadership of that great English statesman, William E. Gladstone, in the years 1853 to 1860, when practically free trade with the world was established in Great Britain. Hence, it will be seen that it took more than 40 years under the leadership of three of England's greatest and most patriotic statesmen to destroy the system of graft and special privilege known as protection.

Mr. Chairman, now that we have begun the work, I pray God that the people of this country will be able to shake off the shackles of this monstrous system in a much shorter period. (Prolonged applause on the democratic side.)