

Texas Democrats and Real Tariff Reform

Well, we feel better about it. When Mr. Bryan's speech was published, a good friend—he has often addressed the readers of the Journal under the caption "Fellow Citizens"—came and said that the impression which the reading of the speech produced was that of mental decadence. We stoutly dissented, but still there lingered the suspicion that we had been beguiled by specious argument.

But after perusing carefully Senator Bailey's speech of Saturday we are entirely satisfied. We knew that if there was any weak spot in the armor of Mr. Bryan's argument the junior senator from Texas would not fail to discover it and drive his lance through. The reading leaves not only the "impression," but the profound conviction, that all Mr. Bryan's points stand absolutely intact.

In the very beginning Mr. Bailey labors hard to make it appear that Mr. Bryan said what he did not say. He nowhere advocates a compensatory duty. In fact, he especially demands the repeal of such duty on manufactured articles of which the raw material is on the free list.

Mr. Bryan is not engaged in academics. He is too sensible and too practical to undertake the outlining of an ideal tariff scheme for an ideal democracy. The tariff exists; it's about as bad as anything can be. And Mr. Bryan is seriously addressing himself to the task of finding some way of making it less obnoxious and burdensome.

Compensatory duties are here. They are imposed on the manufactured article by the same power that places raw material on the duty list. The rich manufacturers collect them by charging it up to the consumer. If it stopped there the case would be bad but not hopeless. The woolen manufacturers pay the government a revenue of \$11,000,000 on imported wool, but by this maneuver they rob the American consumer of many times eleven million dollars. Mr. Bailey's assertion that the placing of the raw material on the free list will not make the finished product cheaper is mere assertion; it is worse, it is twaddle, if it does emanate from the "tallest statesman on the American continent." Repeal of duty on the raw material is sure to be followed by a proportionate reduction of the rate on the finished product.

Mr. Bailey's hair-splitting distinctions about raw material are neither pertinent nor necessary. There is no confusion as to the practical economic meaning of the words.

Mr. Bailey seems perfectly willing to let the wool grower reap a tariff benefit that the cotton and corn raiser must pay for. Any fairness in that? He makes the bombastic offer to remove the tariff from the raw material as soon as it is off the manufactured article. Well, doesn't Mr. Bryan's tentative platform declare that "articles coming into competition with trust-made articles should be placed on the free list?"

What Mr. Bailey says about free lumber is too absurd to deserve serious notice. He declares it monstrous to vote for free raw material as long as the duty remains on the manufactured article, except when it comes to the oil trust interests—then Mr. Bailey votes to put crude oil on the free list. By the by, he finished his speech Saturday night without touching on that point.

The Journal thinks it unnecessary for Mr. Bryan to return to Texas for the present—not until Mr. Bailey advances a better answer than the one made at Dallas.—Belton (Texas) Journal-Reporter.

IN THE CAMP OF THE PROTECTIONIST

When Mr. Bailey contends for equality in taxation we agree with him. But when Mr. Bailey says that "free lumber" would not affect prices here in Texas we think him absurd.

A special lumber train of thirty-five cars went from Texas to Kansas City last week. Is it not plain that a lessening of the demand at Kansas City for Texas lumber would have a tendency to "bear" the price here at home?

Again, Mr. Bailey is strikingly weak when he says that to remit the \$2,000,000 now received on lumber would require the levying of an additional tax on other articles. This is a half truth only. The way to get more revenue, as matters now stand, is to lower the rate, and a lowering of the rate is what we are clamoring

for, seeing that the trusts collect seven dollars for every one dollar that goes into the people's treasury.

We do not favor duty-free lumber; all articles should pay. But unquestionably duty-free lumber would benefit the people as a whole, including our Texas people, and to argue otherwise is to challenge the people's intelligence. And to say that a tax taken off at one place must be made up elsewhere is to juggle with the true situation, for, as Senator Nelson, a good republican, has stated, the higher the rate the less the revenue; hence, to get additional revenue, some rate would have to be reduced, and thus a lessening of the demand on the people's pockets—the demand of the trusts sheltered behind the tariff wall.

Mr. Bailey has not deigned to tell his constituents why he voted for the higher as against the lower rate on lumber. Under the Dingley law the rate was \$2 per thousand. The house, where the present law originated, cut the rate to \$1. When the bill got over into the senate the finance committee reported in favor of a \$1.50 rate. This was resisted by Mr. Beveridge and others. The junior senator from Texas voted to sustain the committee—voted for the higher as against the lower rate. If that vote didn't land the Texas senator in the camp of the protectionists we shall have to revise our tariff primer.—Waco (Texas) Times-Herald.

A NEW IDEA

The Dallas Times-Herald has discovered a new law in political ethics. In the platform suggested by Mr. Bryan appears the phrase, "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 constituent."

The Times-Herald says that it is willing to take Mr. Bryan at his word and adds, "unless ratified at the polls a platform is null and void," and then proceeds to say that as the Denver platform was not ratified by the American people at the polls, it is no longer binding. But what about men elected to office on platforms endorsing that platform, are these not contracts between them and their constituents? If the editor of the Times-Herald will re-read Mr. Bryan's speech at Dallas he will see that Mr. Bryan was proposing a congressional platform. The question is not whether a platform is binding on a defeated candidate, but whether a candidate who is elected upon a platform is bound by it. Mr. Bryan says that a platform is binding upon an official who is elected upon it. Does the Dallas Times-Herald dispute this?

"FOLLOW THE LINE OF ENFORCEMENT"

In an address at Sacramento, Cal., President Taft said:

"We have had evils growing out of our prosperity. Men have seized power by means of accumulation of wealth and its use in methods that are not legal and can not be approved, by way of monopoly and otherwise. But the difficulty is that whenever everybody is prosperous, when everybody is comfortable, then is the time when our old friend Satan steps in and helps along the evil cause. Then is the time when we are apt to be inert and enjoy the things we have without looking forward into the future and seeing that the evils will grow and ultimately swamp us. It is to the people that we must look for an enforcement of these principles. You should select your representatives and have them know you are watching them in congress and see that they follow the line of enforcement."

In the language of Uncle Eben, "Satan is represented as runnin' after folks wif a pitchfork, when de truth is dat so many folks is pullin' at his coat-tails dat he ain't got time to chase nobody."

The people should adopt, in the form of platforms, specific rules for the guidance of public officials and then they should select as their public officials men who may be reasonably expected to adhere to the pledges given to the people and conform to the program which the people, through their platform, have provided.

When it develops that men have been elected to public office who have had the habit of "pullin' at Satan's coat-tails," then those men should be retired.

President Taft spoke well when he said that it is to the people we must look for enforce-

ment of great principles and that the people should make their representatives know that their official conduct is being scrutinized. The application of this is that when the people give power to a political party after that party's leaders have led them to believe that they would revise the tariff downward and the pledge is "redeemed" by revising the tariff upward, then the people should drive them from public place and send their party to oblivion.

Practical Tariff Talks

The casual investigator of the new tariff law will find apparent reason for congratulation when he inspects the wood schedule thereof. Apparently there is a total reduction of 14 per cent on the entire schedule, but if he probes deeper he will find the fraud. When railroads desire to raise rates that will certainly be followed by a protest they do it indirectly, by changing the classification. The tariff makers follow the same process. Timbers of varying sizes make up the buildings we erect. Under the Dingley law these bore a duty of a cent a cubic foot, on "timber, hewn, sided or squared." The new law apparently reduces this rate 50 per cent by making the duty a half cent, but— and here's the joker: the new paragraph reads: "Timber, hewn, sided or squared otherwise than by sawing," the last four words being new matter. As a cold matter of fact these timbers are not hewn, sided or squared in any other way than by sawing. Hewing is a back number method in lumbering. By the interpolation of the four words, "otherwise than by sawing," squared timber is put in the "boards" classification, where the rate is an equivalent of a 50 per cent raise over the old rate.

The same trick of shifting classification is certain to make another department of building more expensive. The duty on structural steel, ready for use, in the Dingley law was \$10 a ton. The new law makes the duty from \$6 to \$8 a ton, according to the value, but the wording of the paragraph has been so changed that structural steel that has been punched is not mentioned at all, the new rate applying to the material that has not been advanced beyond hammering, rolling or casting. Until structural iron is punched it is of no use to the builder, and under the new law the punched material carries a duty of 45 per cent, being included under the classification of "all manufactures of metals not specifically mentioned." This iron sells at an average of about \$35 a ton, and a 40 per cent tariff means \$14 a ton, as compared with \$10 a ton under the old law. Yet the senate finance committee calmly issues an estimate of reductions in which it includes structural steel and iron.

One of the complaints made by the fruit growers of California during the tariff debate was that railroad rates were so adjusted that, the tariff considered, the lemon grower of the Pacific slope was barred out of any market east of Pittsburg. East of that point the Sicilian lemon, slipping through on a cent a pound tariff, was able to undersell the Californian. As lemon growing is a very profitable business and thousands of new trees have been planted in the last few years, the westerners wanted a wider market. So they went down and saw Mr. Aldrich, and he tacked on a 50 per cent raise on lemons, to a cent and a half a pound. Florida pineapple growers felt themselves barred out of some markets that a higher tariff would open to them in this country. They didn't get as much of an increase as they hoped for, but they didn't expect they would. But the maddest men in the country today are the lemon growers of the far west and the pineapple planters of the southland. After they got their tariff, the railroads simply raised their rates sufficient to enable them to absorb the tariff increases. The occasion, however, is not one that calls for any laughter from the consumer. He will have to pay more for his lemons and his pineapples, the only difference being that the increase, instead of going to the fruit-raiser is taken in by the railroads.

C. Q. D.