

he also discusses whether I should have been bound by a plank of a national platform made after my nomination for congress—a plank which I repudiated before the election, but he does not discuss whether an official has a right to repudiate a platform upon which he himself was elected, and which he, himself, defended during the campaign. If he will examine my speech, he will see that I presented a sample platform for a congressional district and insisted that a candidate for congress should announce his belief in the binding force of a platform, and then set forth his platform, so that his constituents could tell whether he reflected their sentiments or not. The question presented is: Is an official bound by a platform pledge or is he free to act as he pleases, regardless of promises made in the platform? I affirm that an official is bound by his platform, but Senator Bailey, if I read his speech aright, does not express an opinion on this subject.

He attempts to create the impression that the free raw material policy is intended to benefit the manufacturer. While in his speech he read the free wool plank of the platform which I proposed, he proceeded to make an argument that ignored a vital part of the plank. We ask not only for free wool but for two other things: First, the abolition of compensatory duties, and second, a substantial reduction in the ad valorem rate. This would not be a favor to the manufacturer, for the abolition of the compensatory duties would more than offset the benefit which he would derive from free raw material, and "a substantial reduction in the ad valorem rate" would bring a still greater advantage to the consumer. Our plan would give to the Texas consumers of woolen goods from five to ten times as much in reduced prices as it would give to the eastern purchasers of wool in a reduction in the price of wool, while his plan compels the Texas consumer of woollens to pay the eastern manufacturers many dollars for every dollar that a tariff on wool collects from the eastern manufacturers. No one but a wool grower will accept his argument on this subject when it is understood—and not all of them.

The main portion of Senator Bailey's speech is devoted to an attempt to answer the argument that a duty on raw material is always transferred to the consumer. He recognizes that he must overcome that argument or confess that his policy would put a higher tax upon the consumer than the consumer would have to pay under our policy. He labors to prove that a tax on raw material would not be transferred under his policy, but he inadvertently uses one sentence that establishes my position. He says: "If the manufacturer transfers the tax on his raw material to his consumer, then I will tell you how to prevent him from doing so. It is as simple as the alphabet. Let us take the tax off the finished product and then he can not transfer his tax on his raw material." Yes, that is more than simple, it is absurd. His plan is to put a tax of 40 per cent on wool for the benefit of the sheep owners (that is the duty today), and, by so doing, increase to that extent the cost of the manufacturers' raw material; but if the manufacturer attempts to add that increased cost to the price of the product his product is to be put on the free list. See how easy it is? That is the way—and the only way—to prevent the transfer of the tax, but, as that method never has been employed and never would be employed, my proposition stands, namely, that a tax on raw material is transferred to the finished product and paid by the consumer. The man who favors a tax upon raw material must know this if he understands the tariff question, and he must intend it when he favors the tax. A tax on raw material, therefore, means the protection of a few producers of raw material at the expense of a large number of consumers, and, as the tax grows, as productions pass through different hands, a small tax levied on raw material generally means a heavy tax on the consumer of the finished product. The best way to relieve the consumer is to remove the tax on raw material and, at the same time, make a still greater reduction in the tax on the manufactured article. In this way you will help the consumer without helping the manufacturer. There are many cases in which the finished product should be put on the free list, as in the case of leather, harness, boots and shoes, but it is not logical to say that there must be no tax upon a finished product unless there is also a tax upon the raw material used in the manufacture of that product.

Senator Bailey's speech proves what I said in my speech in Dallas, namely, that taxation of raw material could not be defended as a na-

tional policy, but must be defended, if at all, purely as a sectional doctrine. It can not be advanced for the benefit of the whole people, but must be advanced, if advanced at all, for the benefit of a few special interests, and it must be defended, if defended at all, upon the same ground that other protective duties are defended.

No matter how patriotic the purpose with which the tax on raw material is proposed, it can not be defended without resort to arguments that are employed by the protected interests, and a protective policy can not be adopted without three results, which follow as a matter of necessity: First, the many are taxed for the benefit of the few; second, the men who get the benefit will attempt to corrupt politics in order to retain that benefit; and, third, the greater the number of those who believe that they are benefited by protection, the more difficult will we find it to secure tariff reform, for the protective interests will stand together, and a few people, well-organized and peculiarly interested in a bad system, are often more than a match for a larger number, unorganized and bearing each one but a small portion of the burden.

I need not discuss the application of the principle of free raw material to the questions which were before congress. I can safely leave Senator Culberson to defend free iron ore, and I can leave him and nearly all the congressmen from Texas to defend the policy of free lumber. I have devoted my time largely to wool, because wool is the keystone of the protective arch, and because the question was not before congress in such a form as to determine the position of senators and members of congress on the subject.

MR. BRYAN'S TARIFF PLANKS

In The Commoner of September 24 a misplaced line resulted in an absurd error in the publication of the tariff planks suggested by Mr. Bryan.

The planks as suggested by Mr. Bryan are as follows:

1. A platform is a pledge, given by the candidate to the voters, and when ratified at the polls becomes a contract between the official and his constituents. To violate it, in letter or in spirit, is not only undemocratic, but repugnant to the principles of representative government, and constitutes an embezzlement of power.

2. We denounce the despotism known as Cannonism and favor such an amendment to the rules of the national house of representatives as will restore popular government in that body and insure the rule of the majority on every question.

3. We endorse the tariff plank of the last national democratic platform and believe that the measure carrying out the promise of that platform should, among other things, provide for:

Free wool, the abolition of the compensatory duties on woollens and a substantial reduction in the ad valorem rate on woollens.

Free lumber, free wood pulp and free paper. Free hides, leather, harness, boots and shoes. Free oil and products of oil.

Free iron ore, free coal and low duties on all manufactures of iron and steel.

Free binding twine, cotton ties and cotton bagging.

Material reductions in the cotton schedules and in the tariff upon all other necessities of life, especially upon articles sold abroad more cheaply than at home, the aim being to put the lowest duty on articles of necessity and the highest on articles of luxury. Articles coming into competition with trust-made articles should be placed on the free list.

No tariff rate should be above 50 per cent ad valorem, except upon liquor and tobacco, and all rates above 25 per cent, excepting those upon liquor and tobacco, should be reduced one-twentieth each year until a 25 per cent rate is reached, the purpose being to reduce the tariff gradually to a revenue basis and thereafter to collect tariff for revenue only.

DROPPING THE MASK

In his speech at Dallas Mr. Bryan said that the men who fought for a tariff on raw materials would be compelled to do it as protectionists and not behind the mask of a revenue tariff. The San Antonio Express seems disposed to drop the mask and make the fight on the New England basis. It says:

"Perhaps such a platform as Mr. Bryan suggests might be acceptable to some east Texas

congressional districts, but such a platform and the candidate seeking election on it would be overwhelmingly rejected by a west or southwest Texas constituency, even though it might be adopted by the national convention of the party. It is doubtful if such a platform would find favor in a convention made up of delegates from the state at large. If it should be, the representatives from those congressional districts which have distinctly declared against the free raw material heresy would consider the platform of no binding force insofar as they are concerned and would make no pretense of abiding by it."

The men who want protection for protection's sake care nothing about parties or platforms. With the protectionists it is money that governs and they are ready to bolt any party or platform that attempts to pull their hands out of the pockets of the people. Thanks to the Express for making clear the purpose of the protectionists of southwest Texas, but is it sure that the less than twelve hundred owners of a million and a half of sheep can control that section of the state? May not the people, who pay 89 per cent duty on woolen goods, decide to take an interest in politics? The special interests are always active, but they become powerless when the taxpayers arouse themselves.

CONSTRUCTION

A few of the Texas democrats are trying to construe the phrase "Such duties (tariff) to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the country and not discriminate between class or sections," to be a declaration in favor of a tax on raw material. Well, if they were republicans they would probably construe "revise" to mean an increase in the tariff.

THE DEMOCRATIC TARIFF POLICY

The Kansas City Star, a newspaper that gave ardent support to Mr. Taft, prints in its issue of September 17 the following editorial:

The Star wishes to call especial attention to the tariff policy suggested by Mr. W. J. Bryan to the democratic party as published this morning. It is submitted that in grasping and presenting a great national issue, in recognizing the shortcomings as well as the opportunities of the democracy in relation to that issue, in comprehending the national gravity as well as the moral and political significance of the public state of mind, Mr. Bryan has, in this statement, surpassed his whole previous record.

The importance of this utterance is enhanced by the fact that it is given to the country just at the time when President Taft, the leader of the republican party, is about to discuss the tariff from the standpoint of the new law and the amendments needed to that law.

Mr. Bryan frankly admits, by implication, that the democratic party is facing the same internal problem that the republican party must solve—the problem of making the elected representatives of the people respect the platforms on which they are chosen. He does not defend those democrats who repeatedly voted for upward revision any more than he would defend those republicans who ignored the promise of their platform for downward revision.

First of all, he would attempt to make platforms more binding, by explicit mandate, on representatives of the democratic party. To make evasion more difficult and to make promises more impressive, he would have the democratic party put into its platform certain specific reductions in the tariff, together with such general limitations of duties as would eliminate from the tariff system the worst instances of extortion. The tentative platform presented is not radical. It is reasonable, especially when considered from the democratic standpoint, for it recognizes the fact that great as the tariff evils are, they can not be eliminated by a single process nor in a single year.

Knowing full well that party pledges are likely to be evaded or misconstrued by those disposed to be disloyal, Mr. Bryan would go farther and demand of every candidate for congress a clear, unmistakable declaration of his tariff policy. This policy would give a two-fold advantage. It would enable the people to know the kind of support they would have in the election of their candidates, and it would give candidates thus elected better security in carrying out the party's pledges and their own.

In short, Mr. Bryan has come to the conclusion that tariff revision is really a matter of men, that unless candidates are pledged indi-