

all sorts of manufactures, whether cloths or clothings or anything else containing a trace of wool, must be weighed up under its benign provisions. If it operated merely to affix excessive rates to articles not entitled to them, it would be bad enough; but it operates also to bring our protective tariff system into ridicule and contempt. Why should a fur coat, with a cotton lining or no lining at all, be assessed 50 per cent ad valorem, while with \$2 worth of wool lining it takes 44 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem? But that is not an extreme case. I spoke the other day of a cotton blanket, with a fringe of wool to prevent untravelling, received hospitably at the customs house and solemnly charged up with the specific compensatory calculated a generation ago for woollen goods, but that is not an extreme case.

Rubber Boots as Wool

We have in the United States an interesting institution engaged in the manufacture of rubber goods, advertising in the Boston newspapers that it absolutely controls the business, as a sign of good credit, so that people in dealing with it will have confidence and persons who are purchasing stock will not be without faith in the enterprise. I notice that in this bill they have enjoyed a slight accretion of duty from 30 per cent to 35 per cent. But I am not going to complain about that, because I have not gone into the practical aspect of the subject. However, the curious thing about it is that throughout a large list of their merchandise they enjoy a protection which congress in its simplicity thought it was extending to clothing made of wool.

It will interest most people to know that the gum boots with which the farmers of America are wading around in the snows of winter are lined usually with wool, and that when a box of them appears at a port of the United States they are not troubled by the 30 per cent duty on manufactures of rubber. Why? Because they are otherwise provided for. How? This law which we refuse to even look at with a view of correcting errors and absurdities transfers this merchandise bodily to paragraphs intended to protect woollen clothing, and we see the fine vaudeville sketch of a pair of rubber boots being solemnly weighed up in the custom houses of the United States and assessed at 44 cents a pound and 60 per cent ad valorem as wearing apparel composed in whole or in part of wool.

This process of mercerization is exactly like washing your hands—of course you lose a little in weight.

A Challenge to an Expert

Now, I want somebody—I do not care who—to stand on this floor and tell me upon whose expert knowledge a protective tariff of one cent, which in many of these cases amounts to 200 per cent and in all of them amounts to 100 per cent, was put on this simple process of mercerizing cloth. I want to see again whose expert knowledge of weaving and finishing cotton is behind that proposition. I think I know him; but I have resolved to bring no more personalities into this controversy. If, however, these people had contented themselves with charging a cent on the mercerization of cloth, I am not certain that I would have been wearying the senate with this recital here today.

But mark the sagacity of these brethren, not of the committee; I do not lay these things to their charge. They are engaged, by the aid of hired experts, in having their own bill explained to them in and around the capitol of the United States.

If you will turn to the little schedule of lead pencils you will find that a group of lead pencil manufacturers, annoyed by some young German boys who are trying to make lead pencils by importing the lead from foreign countries under the present rate of duty, have had their present ad valorem converted into a specific which when stated in plain terms amounts to an increase of 700 per cent or more on the merchandise and totally wipes out of existence independent manufacturers of cheap lead pencils who are selling them to school children of the United States for a cent apiece in our market place.

I spoke years ago in the senate chamber on the subject of the protective tariff system and the speculative trusts. Very few listened to what I said, and I never have met anybody since who appeared to have had any familiarity with the literature which that speech created. And yet it is some satisfaction for me to know it laid down some broad principles and some sound principles, and among them this; that no trust can master this market place in the present state of American enterprise and the present abun-

dance of American capital without first monopolizing the raw material with which business must be transacted. I have felt ever since that a wise thing for the senate to do is not to put trust-made goods on the free list, a remedy which would fall equally upon the just and the unjust, and instead of killing the trust would be more likely to kill the struggling competitors and turn the entire domestic business over to the trust, or, if not, would at least sacrifice American labor, which must be entitled to our consideration, whatever may be the offenses of American capital against our policy and our laws.

An Impressive Warning

Therefore I think we ought to take these great materials that lie at the basis of our productive industries, which are monopolized by corporations organized for that purpose, and give to the young men of the United States in the next generation a free hand in these matters. It is not possible that all our iron and steel is to be made by one corporation. It is not fair to the next generation and it is no improvement on the business methods of the past. It is not right that any great department of industry should be brought into one hand, whether individual or corporate, and therefore I should like to have the senate study the question of putting within reach of the young men of the United States these great resources, and say to them, "Go into these enterprises, and wherever you find yourself constrained in the purchase of your material we will give you relief," so that in no generation shall it be said that a single corporation owns and controls the basic materials that underlie the industries of the American people.

I do not expect, however, to get such a philosophy of life as that into this bill. In fact—I might as well confess it—I do not expect to be able to do more than to state the case; but I warn these men who are among those responsible for the policy of the republican party that if they desire an agitation in the United States to begin the day the bill passes and to be carried on until these wrongs and injuries are rectified, there is no shorter course to that end than that which has been pursued in connection with the measure now before us.

MR. TAFT TAKES HIS STAND

That President Taft not merely means to desert but has in fact already deserted the friends of the income tax is made reasonably certain by the recent reports from Washington.

On April 21 the New York Tribune, chief, as always, of the administration cuckoo papers, published prominently a Washington dispatch from which these excerpts are taken:

"The president indicated to some of his callers today that the senate substitute for the Payne tariff bill met with his approval, that he was not disposed to urge the adoption of any form of special taxation. * * * President Taft said that while he was not opposed to an income tax per se, he would distinctly favor two other forms of taxation as preferable, and would regard a tax on incomes as a last expedient. * * * He admitted that he had cherished some regard for an income tax, but that he had come to regard it as injudicious legislation, except as a last resort. * * * Those who have discussed the Aldrich bill with the president believe that he has been completely won over by the arguments of the chairman of the finance committee and that he will lend his influence, so far as he deems it proper to exert it, to the adoption of the measure by the senate and its acceptance by the house."

On the same day this carefully worded and evidently authorized dispatch was carried by the Associated Press:

"Washington, April 21.—Recent agitation, it is said at the White House, has in no wise changed President Taft's views that an income tax should be in the nature of a last resort for raising revenue for the national government. The president announced when the Payne bill was in the house that he favored the inheritance idea, an excise tax on the dividends of certain corporations and the application of a modified stamp tax in preference to an income levy. He had reiterated this idea almost daily during the past few weeks in discussing the tariff with his callers. The president believes an income tax hardest to collect of all the special taxation devices under consideration and he favors the levy of such taxes as will cause the least friction with the people. President Taft, it is said, has implicit confidence in Senator Aldrich and believes that a satisfactory solution of the tariff

question and of raising increased revenues soon will be reached."

It appears, therefore, that Mr. Roosevelt's successor has taken his stand, definitely and decisively, exactly where Mr. Bryan and the democratic party charged he would in the campaign last fall. He has allied himself with the Aldrich, high-tariff, corporation element of the party and against the LaFollette-Cummins progressive element.

He "cherished some regard for an income tax," as he now cheerfully proclaims—last fall, when he was a candidate for election! But now that he is in office, and the responsibility is before him; when the opportunity is given him to keep faith with the people, he "has come to regard it as injudicious legislation, except as a last resort!"

Similarly as to the question of tariff revision. When he was a candidate for election he defined tariff revision as promised in his platform to mean "on the whole, revision downward."

But now that he is in office, he is satisfied with the Aldrich bill, which, according to the statement of Senator Aldrich himself in his opening speech, would have raised \$8,000,000 more revenue, applied to the importations of 1907, than were raised under the Dingley law! President Taft now stands, therefore, not for revision downward, but for revision upward. He stands not for an income tax, to place on wealth a portion at least of its just share of the burdens of government, but for an increased direct tariff tax on consumption—which is to say, a tax on poverty!

The republican party, from the president downward, is engaged in a deliberate and shameless breach of faith with the people. It promised a special session of congress, not to raise more revenues by higher taxation, but to revise the tariff downward. It is doing that which nobody asked, and refusing to do that which was promised. It is meeting the widespread complaint against the enormities of the Dingley law with a tariff bill which makes them more, not less, outrageous.

The tariff is being "revised by its friends." It is as if the criminal code should be revised by the Amalgamated Association of Professional Lawbreakers. For the friends of the tariff are those whom the tariff gives permission, under form of the law, to rob and oppress their fellow citizens.—Omaha World-Herald.

EVEN THE NEW YORK SUN IS AMAZED

The following editorial is from the New York Sun:

In a speech delivered on the floor of the house on March 26 Representative Fordney of Michigan made the following statement:

"Our present good president, Mr. Taft, has agreed in my presence that during his administration he will not permit, as far as he can avoid it by his action, any further reduction in the sugar schedule if we (presumably referring to the domestic beet sugar interests) will accept this agreement and let the 300,000 tons come in free from the Philippines."

Were this statement less explicit, or had it been made in private conversation, there would be a strong impulse to declare it incredible and impossible. It is little short of inconceivable that Mr. Taft, either before or after his inauguration, should pledge his official influence during his administration to a policy designed to prevent any reduction in the price of one of the most important articles of daily use and consumption in every household, in order to obtain for the Filipinos a fraction of what should be a moral obligation. The tariff increases the price of sugar to consumers by approximately one and a half cents a pound on the nearly 7,000,000,000 pounds annually consumed in this country. A reduction of half a cent a pound would put about \$35,000,000 a year in the pockets of consumers. A reduction of a cent a pound would double the benefit. Is it conceivable that such a possible advantage has been bartered in order to afford the Filipinos a market for a limited quantity of sugar, a market which should be given them as a matter of right?

Surely there is some explanation for so astounding a statement. If such a trade as that reported by Mr. Fordney had been made, nothing would remain to be said except that the transaction was indefensible in law and in morals.—New York Sun.

Reader: Yes, the republican party is to blame for the late spring. It is due to the coldness that has developed between the Aldrich-Payne protectionists and the tariff reform element of the party. The peach crop might have been saved if the freeze had come about election time.