

form demands that all trust-controlled products and lumber, logs, wood pulp and print paper be put on the free list. If iron ore was a trust-controlled product, the platform demands that it be put there, and a vote to put a duty on it by a democrat who believed it to be a trust-controlled product was a violation of the platform. If hides were a trust-controlled product, the platform demanded that they be placed on the free list, and a vote to put a duty on them by a democrat who believed them to be so controlled was a violation of the platform.

I voted for a duty on hides, but I did not believe there was any trust among the hide producers or that there was any trust that controlled their product. On the contrary, I believed the two great trusts, the packer trust and the leather trust, were in a sharp struggle over hides, with the result of good prices for them to the cattleman. If the platform had specifically demanded that hides be placed on the free list I would have so voted, because we would have gone before the people on that pledge.

Mr. Bailey's answer is shrewd, it is catchy, but does not meet the charge. It shrewdly mixes and mingles questions of general policy with the question of unequivocal violation of the platform.

TARIFF FOR REVENUE

No duty that is not a revenue duty is democratic, but not every duty is democratic that is a revenue duty, and Mr. Bailey knows this and himself voted for free coffee, though he knew it would be strictly a revenue duty and that every dollar of burden borne by the people under it would go into the treasury, and that no profit or benefit or protection would be given and no tribute levied by it on all the people for a favored few.

If the democratic convention demands that some great article of common use and necessity, like lumber or coffee, be placed on the free list—and I defy that demand, it is no defense to show that the duty I vote for is a revenue duty. If the democratic convention demands that a trust controlled product be put on the free list and I defy it, it is no defense to show that the duty I vote for is a revenue duty.

With infinite egotism, Mr. Bailey appropriates the income tax to himself. "When I get that income tax," he exclaimed at Fort Worth—and his audience cheered. I think most of them must not have known that anybody but he was going to get it for them or had ever advocated it. They never heard of or had forgotten Mills and Wilson, whose ideas Mr. Bailey absorbed and whose income tax bill he only substantially reintroduced. I refer to this, not merely to speak of Mr. Bailey's consuming vanity, but to use it for another purpose. In the senate he directly attacked the Denver demand that all trust products be placed on the free list and the lumber plank together. He said: "Mr. President, I can not believe the democratic party is serious in commanding us to take the duty off of lumber and wood pulp and still leave the duty on steel products, the manufacture of the most gigantic trust ever organized in the history of the world. Do you tell me that I am commanded to raise revenue on steel products controlled by a trust whose capital aggregates more than a billion of dollars and whose rival companies dare not reduce prices for fear of a price war, that I must leave duties on the commodities of a trust like that in order to raise revenue, and yet I must take it off the newspaper's material?"

The very next paragraph he says: "They tell me we favor the repeal of the duty on every trust-made commodity. I know that could not be applied. Repeal the duty on every article controlled by a trust and we remit \$150,000,000 of revenue at one stroke of the pen."

"CIRCLE" ARGUMENT DESCRIBED

Thus Mr. Bailey tangles himself up. Let the democratic convention ask of him to put any commodity on the free list and he says: "What! Put that commodity on the free list while the products of the greatest trust on earth are protected?" and then when he is asked to put those products on the free list he says: "No, siree! If we put one trust-controlled article on the free list, we must put them all or else we discriminate as between trusts, and if we put them all on the free list we remit \$150,000,000 revenue." His circle is complete. You can't please him with any reason for putting any article on the free list. He will put nothing in God's world on the free list if he wants to vote for a duty and he will give the same reason for his vote that he gave in the senate for his vote on lumber.

My countrymen, if we lose revenue by putting trust-controlled products on the free list, why not rejoice and replace that revenue by lowering the many rates that are now prohibitive? Mr. Bailey has told you that if we remove the duty on one commodity we will always have to raise that same revenue from some other source, and leads you to believe you must do so by placing higher duties on some other commodity.

That we must raise the revenue from some other source is true, but that we must place higher duties on other commodities is untrue and none knows better than Mr. Bailey that there are hundreds of prohibitive duties which bring little or no revenue into the treasury, but impose millions of burdens of tribute on the people and that the surest way to increase our revenue is to lower these prohibitive duties, giving at the same time greater revenue to the government and lighter burdens to the people. But, if lower duties should by any possibility fail to raise all the revenue needed to replace that lost by putting trust-controlled and certain other products on the free list, let us rejoice still more because then we will have to adopt an income tax or some other measure by which wealth will bear its just share of the expenses of government.

Over and over again Mr. Bailey refuses to put some commodity on the free list because of the duty on the products of this steel trust. The carpenter's hammer and saw are not on the free list, and therefore he declares he won't put the products of this or that trust on the free list. I know he did pick out some commodities and say he was willing and anxious to vote to put them on the free list; articles like carpenter's tools and farm implements, and I would gladly vote with him to put them there, but he did this when there was not a shadow of showing to get them there, and then he used their not being there to justify his vote against putting on the free list another article of common and universal use, logs, timber and lumber, both raw material and finished product, when, if all democrats had pulled together we might have gotten them on the free list.

PRINT PAPER

In the same way he voted against putting print paper on the free list because he said they didn't put with it letter paper, the merchant's account book paper, and that this was a discrimination. If they had proposed to put letter paper on the free list, doubtless, to his mind, that would have discriminated against print paper, which is used for the newspapers and magazines, that the common people read, and the school books that nearly 20,000,000 children study.

All through his speeches you will find this one thing waiting on the other—the thing we might get on the one, or many things we might not get.

I am not that way. Whenever I get the chance I will put stockings on the free list, if I can't get hats; I will put shirts on the free list, if I can't get coats; I will put hammers and plows, if I can't get lumber, and I will put lumber on the free list from which the farmer builds his cottage and barn, the laborer and employe his modest home and the poor man builds his cabin, his cradle and his coffin even though I can't put the hammer and the nails there, too.

LUMBER RATE

But that is not all of Mr. Bailey on lumber. He not only voted against free lumber, but he voted against the lower duty of the house and for a higher duty as proposed in the senate. He tells you at Fort Worth that he voted to reduce the duty on lumber from \$2 per 1,000 to \$1.50 per 1,000. He did not tell you, however, that that \$1.50 rate was the rate fixed by the republican senate committee amendment to the lower rate of the republican house bill, or that he voted against the lower rate of \$1 per 1,000 of the house bill, and that the republican president claims credit for compelling the conference committee to place the rate at \$1.25 per 1,000, being 25 cents below the rate for which Mr. Bailey boasts of voting.

You will do well to read all those votes of Mr. Bailey's very carefully. It was certainly unfortunate for our party that Mr. Bailey spent too much of his time and great ability in arguments against the Denver platform, justifying his vote against its only demands that might have passed—with solid democratic support—and in raising a question not presented in that platform, the question of free raw material, under the discussion of which the platform, its pledges and their violation might be forgotten;

but I trust in God that whatever may be our differences about this new-old question of free raw material, we will not forget these pledges and the righteousness of every one of them.

PRICE OF LUMBER

But I must not forget Mr. Bailey's other argument, that the duty on lumber does not increase its price to us. Let me talk to you about that. In 1907 before a lumber convention Mr. McCormick, a great lumber king, estimated the standing timber of the United States at thirteen hundred billions of feet, of which California had two hundred billions, Oregon four hundred billions, Montana and Idaho one hundred billions, Washington two hundred billions, all the southern states two hundred billions and all the rest two hundred billions.

This estimate is very close to that of the government.

Mr. McCormick declared: "The trouble (increasing prices) lies not in the cost of manufacturing, but in the dwindling supplies of timber. The fields of timber are known to be narrowing to the Pacific coast. Within half a dozen to ten years the Pacific coast will be the only source of great supply."

Who owns these immense fields of timber? Mr. Skinner, M. C. and big lumberman, this spring at a banquet at the Willard, declared that "90 per cent of the timber of the Pacific states is held by sawmill operators; big timber companies." Mr. Weyerhaeuser testified that he bought in one deal in 1900 forty billions of feet at 15 cents per thousand. That timber is now said to be worth \$3 per thousand and it is estimated that the Weyerhaeuser companies own more than two hundred billions of feet, equal to all the standing timber of the southern states.

How is it in the south? Mr. McCormick said: "The southern pines are being destroyed with a rapidity that finds its parallel only in the case of the northern white pine. In ten or fifteen years there will be a most serious shortage of southern pine."

SOUTHERN TIMBER

In the south also the timber has gone into the hands of big companies and syndicates. It is estimated that over 70 per cent of the standing timber of the south is owned by non-residents or corporations controlled by non-resident stockholders.

The American Lumberman, July 5, 1907, said: "About five years ago a change came in the yellow pine business. Stumpage went up in price since it had passed into strong hands. Mill operators with large capital and extensive equipment began to control a large share of the product and naturally asked profitable prices for it. In the southern fields the small mills are practically eliminated."

These lands in Texas, my friends, were bought for a song, and after they got into "strong hands" we saw the prices of lumber begin to jump. When I read in 1906, when I was first discussing this matter with our people—some of you remember it—the syndicate monthly price list issued from St. Louis and sent to all retail dealers in Texas, giving the exact and same price at all the big lumber mills in South Texas, I knew where the money for our high-priced lumber went, and I knew where it came from, for I had been buying little bills of lumber from time to time, and I knew when Mr. Bailey said that only 20 per cent or 30 per cent of the cost of buildings was in the lumber, it was not true as to the buildings used by the common people—by the farmer, the average man and the poor man. If it were true, it might mitigate, but would not justify his vote against the interest of the great masses and in favor of the few.

If all the lumber kings in America swore it, I could not believe there was no lumber combine or co-operation to fix the price of lumber.

I knew when Mr. Kirby was taking options or buying pine land and when he was said to have come back with millions of eastern capital to develop Texas and when he was buying out mill after mill, and when lumber began to jump. It is for these men, syndicates and foreign stockholders, that we are asked to indorse a tariff on lumber to "distribute the effects of the tariff."

Oh, but Mr. Bailey says the tariff will not affect the price of lumber in Texas. Do you believe it? Ask any stumpage man or big mill man in any state of the union if he will vote to nominate any man for congress who favors free lumber. Mr. Bailey says that free lumber would only affect Canadian border states; that they would get cheaper lumber and our Pacific states lumber would come further south and

(Continued on Page 10)